

CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS PUBLIC HEARING

DATE TAKEN: August 9, 2004
TIME: 9:00 a.m. - 4:00 p.m.
PLACE: 1300 Franklin Street, 6th Floor
Vancouver, Washington

COURT REPORTER: Cindy J. Holley, CSR

PROCEEDINGS

MORRIS: Good morning everyone. The Clark County Board of Commissioners is meeting on Monday which is not our usual meeting day but we are holding public hearings this morning and this afternoon in our final rounds of discussion on the new comprehensive plan. We did have emerge just late on Friday yet another map and so before we move on to anything else, in the interest of getting it on the table at the earliest possible moment in public view I'd like to ask our Planning Director Pat Lee to walk us through the new map.

LEE: Thank you, Commissioner. Actually in terms of presentation I'm scheduled to respond to several requests from the Board. At last Tuesday's hearing the Board indicated that we should investigate options for discussion of potentially increasing densities within the unincorporated Vancouver UGA so we have prepared a map that does that. And there was also direction from the Board to try and present information on capital facilities by jurisdiction, as well as trying to present information that may indicate whether expanding urban growth boundaries in one area of the county is more cost effective than another, so we have material that has been submitted addressing all those things.

But to start off with I will review the land use alternative that we had developed and I believe there's some copies available on the back table for individuals to take a look at. Generally if you look at the January 14th map, the densities being achieved within the unincorporated Vancouver UGA is 5.2 to 7.7 units per acre which falls short of the 8 units per acre goal for the Vancouver UGA as a whole. I will say that the Vancouver UGA as a whole when you include the city does at the upper end of the range meet the 8 units per acre standard with the January 14th map, but we felt that we should at least present options for discussion to increase densities in the unincorporated portion as well. And the general changes to the map, Evan, do you want to put that up on the screen.

There was two options that were mentioned. There was a possibility of upzoning within the existing UGA. Based on discussions with Mr. Lowry we feel that is certainly a path that could be taken, although it would be through a separate process. To give you an indication of what that might accomplish, if you went from a R-18 zoning and changed that R-18 zoning in the existing UGA to R-22 so you're within the same land use category, you would increase densities at the minimum end from 5.5 to 6.44 units per acre and at the maximum end from 8.2 to 8.71 units per acre. And that's within the existing UGA. And again, that is certainly an option if the Board wants to pursue that.

Another option which is captured on the map is taking the urban growth boundary expansion area that we are looking at and doing a few things. One, we did remove some land from the UGA around the Fairgrounds that is designated for residential and that's not shown on the 8 and a half by 11. The 8 and a half by 11 map only shows the areas where intensification of uses is proposed. The large map that we have on display shows the entire map. We also eliminated the Meadow Glade pursuant to the City of Battle Ground's most recent

recommendation in the, in the complete map. But in general if you work your way from 50th Avenue in the east to 162nd Avenue on the west, we are increasing the single-family residential zoning from R1-7.5 and most of that block between 50th and 72nd to R1-6, that portion immediately adjacent to the Pleasant Highlands Neighborhood remains R1-7.5. At the 72nd Avenue, anticipating significant expansion of 72nd Avenue we have introduced some R-30 zoning which previously was shown as R1-7.5. We are also anticipating significant improvements to 119th Street and so we are suggesting that you could change R1-6 designation, oh, sort of just west of where the Lewis and Clark Railroad comes in to R-22 right along the road. And we also have introduced some R-30 zoning opposite the industrial reserve designated to the east of 503 south of 119th.

We have also recommended that the R1-6 zoning throughout most of the remainder of the area south of 119th be designated R1-5. And we have expanded the mixed use area to the far east of the map adjacent to the business park uses and we've taken out the Westminster Walk and another large rural subdivision at the eastern end of the map out of the urban growth boundary. And what that accomplishes without upzoning inside the existing UGA it improves our density range to 5.7 at the minimum and 8.5 for the entire UGA. So that is the option that has been presented for discussion and consideration and be happy to answer any questions.

MORRIS: Mr. Lee, did you do an analysis on the shift of load to the Battle Ground School District?

LEE: No, we have not done a specific analysis of what the student impact would be.

MORRIS: Thank you. Other questions?

STANTON: Not right now anyway.

MORRIS: Go ahead.

LEE: Do you want me to proceed with the capital facilities information then?

MORRIS: Yes.

LEE: Okay. Evan, could you put up the population of employment growth summary table. This is the table on Page --

MORRIS: Mr. Lee, what packet did you distribute to the Board that would have that in it? Is that the one that was in our --

LEE: There is a white paper without letterhead that says "Capital Costs versus Population and Employment."

MORRIS: Okay, thank you.

LEE: And what we tried to accomplish with this series of tables, one, we did organize it by jurisdiction and we have attempted to isolate rural populations from those in the urban growth areas in making this analysis. And roughly the table up on the screen, across the top probably the key columns to look at are the last three columns because we've tried to present an analysis of per capita costs or per employment costs or the two combined. So for example we have divided the sum of the capital facilities information from each jurisdiction into and analyzed that in terms of what the cost per population would be and also what the cost per job would be, just simple division, and then also combining the two together. And the basic totals you see across the bottom in terms of what the total population would be starting with 342177 in the base year 2000 and moving up to 523604 in 2023.

MORRIS: I don't -- did you do a division to show the ratio of jobs to population then?

LEE: Yeah. I think we didn't do a specific division to show the ratio of jobs to population, but perhaps go -- why don't you go to the County Vancouver example, we'll walk through that. So in the second column estimated 20-year cost in millions, this is just taking the number, this is on Page 9 of that package, sorry, the estimated 20-year cost is just summarizing the 20-year cost that's contained in the capital facilities information that we have reviewed. The cost per total population, basically you're just dividing the total cost by the total population anticipated within that geographic area. So for the County you get 3,567 of capital expenses for each individual. In terms of the number of jobs in the area the same sort of analysis, for each job the capital costs are about 7,092. And then when you combine both the population and the employment as a whole and divide it again into the total cost you get 2,373 overall costs apportioned among jobs and population. And we are trying to do this simply to give you some sort of comparative analysis of what it might cost in one UGA as opposed to another UGA.

If you go to -- why don't you put up the summary table, Evan. So kind of using that process for each UGA, the summary which is on Page 3 of the package gives you if you go to again the same, the same process just ordered by each UGA. So CFP costs to population divided by population and employment is 7,798 in Battle Ground; 6796 in Camas; 5544 in La Center; 11198 in Ridgefield; 2738 in the City portion of the Vancouver UGA; 2373 in the County portion of the UGA; for the UGA as a whole 2527; and Washougal 3843 per population and employment factor. So that is the best that we could do given the information that we have in terms of the relative expense of developing one area versus another at least cross-reference to the population and jobs that we expect to locate there. And we did the same analysis using the school districts and that is on the table immediately below. Battle Ground School District 3966 per population; Camas 2383; La Center 5675; Ridgefield 1902; Vancouver 1214; Evergreen 866; and Washougal 6070. So that is our attempt at trying to give you at least some comparative weighting of what may be relative cost differentials of developing in certain areas of the county.

There is one other table that I think Commissioner Stanton was interested and that is something called "Funding for Capital Facilities" and basically it just delineates the principal funding sources that are used to provide the various infrastructure services. Where information is available we tried to present an apportionment among these sources, how much was from one source versus another source. And the actual relative contribution of one source versus another source is not well articulated in the information that we have reviewed, but that is again just trying to get a sense of what are the principal funding sources that will provide the capital facilities to support the plan that's adopted as part of the update. That concludes my presentation.

MORRIS: Questions?

PRIDEMORE: Yeah. On the first -- going to the summary sheet on the capital facilities plan, Pat, the total estimated capital facilities plan costs is based on the January map?

LEE: Yes.

PRIDEMORE: Is that -- that's not as revised or suggested by your --

LEE: No, it's based on, it's based on the January map.

PRIDEMORE: Okay. And then the total population and/or total employees, is that just in the expansion areas or is that the entire jurisdiction?

LEE: We have tried to break it out by UGA of what it would be.

PRIDEMORE: So when we say capital facilities plan costs divided by population, that population represents everybody in that UGA including existing residents?

LEE: Yes. I believe that's correct, yes.

PRIDEMORE: All right. So can I read this to be, and I don't want to pick on Battle Ground except they're at the top of the list, Battle Ground School District 3,966, call it \$4,000, this would say that each man, woman and child in Battle Ground would need to pay \$4,000 over 20 years to support the capital facilities plan costs?

LEE: Yes.

PRIDEMORE: Would that be net of State contributions?

DUST: No.

LEE: No. No, we haven't netted out what the State contributions are, it's just a total, total figure to give you kind of a relative idea of what it costs.

PRIDEMORE: The funding for capital facilities page talking about the Hazel Dell District in 2010 is expected only 56 percent will be paid by connection. Is that their information or is that something you guys have estimated?

LEE: I think it is based on information that we have discussed with them.

PRIDEMORE: So they anticipate that in 2010 44 percent of expansion costs will be paid by ratepayers?

LEE: Based on the information that we have considered, yes.

MORRIS: Actually from my work on the Waste Water Advisory Board the percentage is higher than that for new connection charges, but ratepayers do underwrite the cost of upgrading for environmental regulatory purposes, so they bear some of that cost but it's not as much as 44 percent.

PRIDEMORE: Is that the same for La Center and the 47 percent?

MORRIS: I don't know about La Center, that would be a question for CPU and they're not a part of that group.

PRIDEMORE: Those are all my questions.

STANTON: Can I go back to the school on the summary page just to make sure I understand. Craig used the example of Battle Ground. Does that include the current needs that they have?

LEE: It would include all the needs that they have told us they have to accommodate the plan through 2023.

STANTON: Okay. So that's not --

MORRIS: Without the increases?

LEE: Pardon me?

MORRIS: Without any increases?

LEE: Without any --

STANTON: By the density that you're talking about here.

MORRIS: Right.

LEE: Oh, yes. Yes. All this is --

STANTON: Current shortfall --

LEE: -- all this capital facilities information is based on the January 14th plan and the land uses that were shown in them.

STANTON: Last question: Did anybody sleep this weekend? You guys did good, thank you for all this information.

LEE: Well, it's a lot of people worked hard to pull it together, but it's also an awful lot of information to be presenting to you at the hearing.

MORRIS: Any other questions? Ready for public testimony? Okay. Mr. Printz, you're all organized and ready to go.

PRINTZ: Good morning. Randy Printz, 805 Broadway. I'm here on a -- on behalf of a variety of folks and what I would like to do this morning is to talk primarily about the urban holding, talk a little bit about mixed use, and then five or six pieces that you guys have previously looked at that are currently proposed for inclusion and just to briefly remind you of those. Some of the things in GMA that you guys have been going through for the last five years are open to a great amount of interpretation. The law itself gives you a wide array of tools, it gives you a vast amount of local control and it gives you a broad range of discretion, and I think what you've been doing for the last five years since we started this process in '99 is trying to figure out how to best exercise that discretion.

But there are some things that in GMA that are not discretionary and I may be in the minority of some of my, of some of my colleagues or some of the business community and whether or not GMA is a good thing or a bad thing for the business community, but my view is that there are a lot of good things about GMA for the business community. If you look at the text of GMA, you just read the Act or look at this Legislative history, there's nothing in GMA that says control growth or talks about controlling growth or talks about stopping growth or talks about encouraging growth, GMA isn't about that. If you read what GMA says and read the Legislative history behind it, what GMA mandates is that we provide an adequate supply of land for the 20-year population projection that's going to come here and that we select the urban services that we are going to -- that this community chooses to pay for to provide for that 20-year population projection. At its most basic element that's what GMA says that we should be doing.

In 1994 different Board but the Board of County Commissioners chose the highest population estimate that was available to them and included in that a 25 percent market factor and even with that we grew faster, more people came here than we anticipated, and the result of that was that we ended up with artificially inflated land prices and we ended up with an underprovided capital facilities plan, make more congestion, we have higher land prices. The reason the people for the most part are going to come to this community or any other

community has much less to do with the price of land or the availability of land, the land supply, as it does with whether or not this is a good place to be. I'm not going to pick on Yacolt, but if you enlarge the Yacolt urban growth boundary 25 times or 50 times and made it a giant urban growth boundary, you would not fill Yacolt tomorrow or the next day with people. People come here and other places in the country because they want to be here.

I'm not attempting and I'm not going to this morning talk about or try to get you to change the population projection that you have selected, that's a decision that long ago was made, but it is very, very relevant to the urban-- the issue of urban holding. Right now staff is recommending that we place urban holding on every square inch of land that is potentially going to be proposed for inclusion inside the urban growth boundary, this is the same land that GMA says that you are required to add for the 20-year population projection. GMA doesn't say, at least anywhere that I can find, that you can identify that land and say maybe some day, 5 years, 10 years, from now we might bring it in under a very unspecified set of criteria. What it says is is that when you amend your comp plan, you need to provide a 20-year supply of land for the population projection that you chose.

If you look at the actual proposed ordinance and you ask yourself how does the community or a property owner get this, get this proposed land out of holding and into, into the required land supply, how does that happen, well, there appear to be one of two ways. One is through annexation and a City as you know may or may not choose to annex any particular piece of property in its, in its UGA. There are lots of places in the city of Vancouver for example or in the Vancouver UGA that will not be annexed for a very long time due to just geographic reasons, political reasons, it's unlikely that Hazel Dell will any time soon be a part of the Vancouver city limits. We just went through a project and -- or a piece of property in Washougal. This piece was like a 10-acre piece of property, it was added in 1994 when Washougal probably had the smallest urban growth boundary. This is one of ten pieces of property that are outside of the Washougal municipal limits but inside their UGA and the City Council voted to not annex it about three weeks ago. Fortunately I was able on reconsideration to get them to rethink that and they ultimately added it, but it highlights the difficulties with annexation and the fact that those -- that annexation is by far from a sure thing either today, 5 years from now or 10 years from now or longer.

The other mechanism which appears to be sort of the primary mechanism that this ordinance will or anticipates utilizing is this interlocal agreement and the questions I have are, and if you look at this, who is the interlocal agreement with. Is it with the City. Is it with the urban service providers, fires, schools, police, Sheriff, power companies, TV cable companies, we don't know from this. This says that all of those services have to be, have to be supplied but it doesn't tell you who those agreements are with. There's no requirement that any of those entities, particularly the Cities, sign or execute any of those agreements and without that not any land will get added. There's absolutely no guarantee under this ordinance that today, 5 years from now or 19 years from now that any land will get added to the UGA. This ordinance I'm sure, and I'm sure that staff anticipated that these agreements would get executed or hope that they would get executed, but there is nothing in here that requires

anybody to do anything. In the City of Vancouver's case the only difference between the language for the City and the other -- or the City of Vancouver and the other small cities is this 180 day rule, if you want to call it that, and what this says is that if the County initiates an interlocal agreement, then within 180 days the City of Vancouver either has to say yes or no or negotiate. And if they don't, then the County can essentially take the urban holding off, but it doesn't require the County at any time over the next 20 years to initiate that process. That process could get initiated 5 years, 10 years, 15 years from now, at which point the 180 days gets triggered. There is, there is simply nothing in the urban holding language that requires any land to be added at any point in the future.

It also requires that full urban services can be provided by the applicable City and other special districts including schools, fire, police, water, sewer, roads and drainage. Who decides what, what level-of-service that is, who decides what the full level-of-service is that has to be provided before any of this land, before the urban holding gets taken off. I suspect that if you went to some of those urban service providers today even inside the existing urban growth boundaries, they would say that that, that those, that level-of-service is not being met. I don't believe that the County can legally delegate its mandated authority under GMA to provide the land supply for the population projection to schools, other municipalities, fire districts and any of the other urban service providers that are, that are called out in the ordinance. It's one thing to say that, that for land that is going to be brought in you need to provide sewer, water, adequate transportation, all the things that all of our existing regulatory structure does today and say that you meet those. And if you don't meet those, then you don't get to develop your property.

If there is a problem with those ordinances today in terms of there being cracks in the armor or places where people can, can develop things without meeting certain levels-of-service, concurrency exemptions, those sorts of things, then change the ordinance so that those things don't occur, but it's another thing to say that we will try to establish some day in the future some yet undefined levels-of-service with yet undefined service providers and we are going to hope that there is some sort of agreement between all of those folks before one square inch of land can get added to the UGA. I don't believe that there is anything in the Growth Management Act that allows that type of process to occur where you have identified a need to add land.

Finally, the, the ordinance also requires this removal of the urban holding to be done in, in the context of the subarea. It doesn't say whether that's a 50-acre subarea, 100, 500, who decides the urban, the County, the Cities, urban service providers, I don't know. I know that staff and this Board have worked extremely hard over the last five years to, to get us to where we are. I know that for this Board particularly that whatever you do and the decisions that you make in this process that you will be it is a political no win for you. I mean there will, there will be regardless of what you do most people will probably not be happy, but I don't understand how after five years and \$2 and a half million of taxpayers' money that we can come to a place where we say we still cannot identify one square inch of property that we can say that we can adequately serve to address the fairly substantial land supply and demand that we've identified

we're going to need to serve a 20-year population projection. I don't believe that this urban holding is legally defensible and I think that it renders the rest of the plan legally indefensible.

On mixed use, very quickly, and it looks like some of that's been changed at least and we've sort of gone through a variety of iterations on the maps for mixed use, I guess all I would, I would ask of you is that, one, locate, locate mixed use in areas that the market will support which is typically along major arterials. Your own existing comp plan requires or sets out for its locational criteria for commercial that it be at the intersections and major arterials, placing mixed use in areas that doesn't -- do not meet that will make it virtually indevelopable because the market simply will not support that 25 percent chunk of commercial that you've got to have. The proposed ordinance says that it -- and it is supposed to be dense, more dense than a suburban community, at least 12 units per acre gross. So if you've got a 10-acre piece of property, let's say half of it's wet, so you've got 5 acres left to develop, you still have to meet that 12 dwelling units per acre gross, so you now are doing 24 units per acre in order to meet your minimum density on the other 5. You're also supposed to respect the surrounding neighborhood and do and accomplish this in a gradual transition.

I'm not sure what that means, but I do know that it will be extremely difficult to gradually transition from R1-10 to 20 units, even 12 units, per acre five times what -- four or five times what the existing or the surrounding area will be even when you've got pieces of property that, that are 5 or 10 or 20 acres in size. The bigger you go obviously the easier it gets, but a lot of that depends on their configuration and most of the lots out there, the ag lots, and I should understand this but I don't, but a few of them are square, most of them are sort of long and rectangular, and from the size it will be very, be very difficult to, to meet minimum densities and be able to, to make that transition.

The ordinance says it must be developed as a single entity. I'm not exactly sure what that means, but it -- and it's also supposed to have a variety of complimentary, mutually supporting and integrated uses. Now I think I know what "complimentary" means and "mutually supportive" and "integrated" when you talk about those words sort of as we are right now, but I don't have the foggiest idea of what I'm going to tell a client who calls me a mixed use developer who says I would like to do a mixed use project in Vancouver in the Vancouver UGA or in Clark County someplace, will this project, you know, what do I have to do to comply with the code, will the project that I have in my, in my head or that I did it at, you know, at someplace else, will that work here. I can't tell them. There is zero predictability about, about what, what those things mean. We're also supposed to achieve connectivity and physical functional integration. Again I have some idea about what those things might be, but I can't begin to tell a client what, what that actually means on the ground and I would challenge 20 people or 10 people or 5 people to get together and look at those and have them all come up with the same answer.

Once -- my suggestion on mixed use is this. Steve Stuart and I actually just got done working on the mixed use ordinance in Camas and actually drafted something that I'm not suggesting is appropriate or that the Board would like for Clark County, but we at least sat down and I

think agreed on what the ideas of mixed use are and in many cases those ideas are good. And there are laudable goals for mixed use, but the trick is is trying to convert those into, one, something that the surrounding area and the local governmental entity likes and that the market will support and that still achieves the goals that you're trying to achieve. We think we have done that in Camas. And in fact very shortly we're going to go back to Council, that ordinance is now before Council and will get considered. What I would -- what I guess I would suggest to this Board is that they appoint a small for a focus group to sit down and spend some time that had some neighborhood folks and some mixed use development folks and that could try to sit down and come up with something that would be what you would want to see, that the neighborhoods would like, and that the market would support. That's a pretty high bar but, but it's not impossible.

Finally, I want to just briefly run you through a couple of, a couple of pieces of property. Thanks, Evan. All of these are -- at least on today's map are still in. It isn't clear to me. These colors are from January 14 and I would greatly appreciate it if Pat could tell me whether or not the ones that I've got marked whether or not they have changed from I think this is R1-6. I don't know whether you can tell me off the top of your head, but it would be helpful.

LEE: Which?

PRINTZ: The -- this one up here is the Defrees piece. It is -- and it's south of 119th. It is, yeah, that's it, south of 119th. 138th is right here, it's flat, it is very developable, it has urban services to it. This piece right here, the Horsley piece, the Somarakis piece and Fraiser pieces all sort of fit that same description, they all have urban services that are available to them, they are adjacent -- either adjacent to the boundary or adjacent to existing urban development. The -- have you got the UGA that's immediately, maybe that one will work to the, just to the west of there on 119th. Will that go far enough?

DUST: To the west?

PRINTZ: Yeah. Where does it end?

MORRIS: Can you do your best to line them up with the streets, at least with something that's a major cross-section like 117th, 119th, Evan.

PRINTZ: This is 117th.

MORRIS: Right.

PRINTZ: You probably can't see what I'm doing here, sorry.

MORRIS: No. But if he, if he, if he puts the other map on top as he did a minute ago, if he could at least align the intersection. There that --

PRINTZ: Oh, I see.

MORRIS: -- yeah, thank you.

PRINTZ: Okay, that's great.

MORRIS: Thank you. Okay.

PRINTZ: It doesn't look like -- what color is this or what is this?

LEE: That's R1-5.

PRINTZ: Okay. And the yellow is?

LEE: I think that's, I think that's those are all R1-5. At least in the map presented earlier today they're R1-5, yes.

PRINTZ: Okay. Great. And then this is the Gramor piece I think.

LEE: Yes.

PRINTZ: And this is community commercial. And this is mixed use, is that what that color is?

LEE: Yes. That has not changed.

PRINTZ: Okay. I'm-- we have been asking for and maybe the only, the only property owner that has testified before you asking to have no residential and no commercial and to have industrial and they would, they would strongly prefer to have that big chunk of mixed use to be industrial for a variety of reasons, not the least at which is the code requires a market study to do commercial and we had a large market study done which showed that there was enough commercial right here to serve the surrounding area, there was demand, there was need. I also see from this that staff has added some commercial on the other side of the street, I think that's what that is, mixed use requires 25 percent of this to be commercial and so it, that doesn't make a -- it's just more commercial than the market will support there. They would love to have industrial in an area where it seems that it's a large enough piece and that it would fit. And at various times, I don't know what -- this is public facility, Pat, is that what the green is?

LEE: Yeah. Yes.

PRINTZ: Okay. For some time that was, was, was industrial and other times I think it's changed, but in any event they would still simply like to have industrial if --

LEE: No, actually, no. You were -- they're actually -- the colors changed as well and that's still business park I believe.

PRINTZ: Okay. So they are BP, okay.

LEE: Yeah.

PRINTZ: So that would, I mean.

STANTON: Wait a minute.

MORRIS: I'm really confused now. Evan, please identify on the new map which parcel he's talking about.

STANTON: The mixed use one.

PRINTZ: Yeah. There. And you can't see what I'm, what I'm doing here.

DUST: What do you want to point to?

PRINTZ: I know, I know it's difficult. This whole piece here is, is Gramor's piece, the commercial and the mixed use, and they are simply requesting that they're very happy with the commercial designation, that's what they sought, that's what the market study indicated was needed. The mixed use portion of that they would simply like to have as industrial rather than mixed use. So if you're looking for a place to get rid of some population and some houses, this would be a, a potential place to do that.

MORRIS: And what was it on the January map?

PRINTZ: The same, commercial and mixed use. It's -- yeah. It hasn't changed.

MORRIS: So it's been that way for a while?

PRINTZ: It has.

MORRIS: Okay, thank you.

PRINTZ: A couple of others and I will get out of here.

DUST: Where do you want to go?

PRINTZ: Right here.

DUST: I'll trade you.

PRINTZ: Thanks. Okay. The H piece, which maybe Evan can point, yeah, can point to that, that's a piece owned by Mark Hinton. It's surrounded by the existing UGA on two sides. It's got utilities stubbed to it from the subdivision to the south. It will access 179th when it's developed where there is adequate transportation capacity. It is a very flat piece. It's an old field right now. Washington State sits virtually just, just to the south of it. You have a very good view of WSU from, from there. There was some testimony, and I want to say it was by Mary Ann Simonds, that there are, there were some critical areas in this and on the very southern portion of the site in the south, that's exactly right, Evan, in the very southwestern corner there is a stream corridor that runs along there and that, that is true. It affects about three percent of the site. The County's habitat ordinance and everything else would apply, it doesn't get developed, it seems like a very reasonable piece to come in. It has no other topographic constraints on the vast remaining portions of the property and it just seems like a logical candidate to come in because it's bordered on both sides and it has all urban services available to it and lots of good transportation capacity. Finally --

DUST: What do you want to show?

PRINTZ: Right what you got. What I'm looking for, Evan, is this.

DUST: That parcel?

PRINTZ: Yeah. Let's see. This is we're in Salmon Creek, that's Bliss Road, this piece that's, that you see highlighted in black, both of those parcels are owned by the same entity. It has a road as you can see up from the south stubbed directly to it. It actually has sewer stubbed onto the property, it's flat, it has no critical areas. The property owner has been seeking for actually since not too long after the '94 got done to have it included. It is a logical piece due to the availability of urban services. It's the McCune piece which I know you guys are familiar with. That's all I have unless the Board has some questions.

MORRIS: I have a question on your discussion of mixed use. You've raised an interesting point about whether or not we can legally delegate our requirement under the law to provide a land supply to other service providers, which you are suggesting we do by requiring interlocal agreements with those people. Assume we did have the legal authority, this I'm asking you to hypothesize because it's occurring in my mind, all jurisdictions in the state are required to update their comprehensive plans rapidly within the next few years. Assuming everyone took this approach to all new land and all new land across the state was added in holding, what would be the ramifications?

PRINTZ: Well, this --

MORRIS: Because we are not -- I mean I think that that is a very realistic question to ask because all jurisdictions are in exactly the same circumstance as we are, we are not singular or

unique.

PRINTZ: The issue, the issue is I guess is two, two or three-fold. One, in terms of the legal issue it's the same here as it is everywhere else, which is simply could this work, yes. Could -- is it possible that all of the urban service providers and municipal bodies got together in a very short period of time, did whatever additional capital facilities planning was necessary, agreed on everything, signed the document and the urban holding got lifted, is that possible, yes. Is it likely, no. And does it have to happen, no. And because of that that's, that is what in my belief. And I, and Rich may disagree with me, but I, I feel pretty, I feel pretty confident that it is if you set up a mechanism that does not require the land that GMA requires to be added to the boundary and that there is absolutely no assurance in this, in this ordinance that that will happen, I don't believe that that is even facially compliant with GMA.

What happens on the ground is that, one, the price of land continues to be artificially escalated, not just for, for residential developers but for commercial, for schools, for public facilities, you get, continue to get increased transportation congestion because you're going to increase density further than it is already so. I don't know if that's the answer that you were looking for but --

MORRIS: Well, I guess, I guess what I'm, I'm inviting anyone in the course of the day to challenge what is occurring in my mind, which is if all jurisdictions across the state were to do this, we would bring growth and development to a screeching halt. And it being the case, that we are totally dependent statewide on private contributions to infrastructure capacity that we would essentially freeze economic growth. So I invite anyone during the course of the day to please challenge me on that if you would. If -- because if it is legal for us, it is legal for everyone. It's an interesting discussion anyway.

STANTON: Yeah, I got the gist of your question as being more a question of ability to finance capital facilities. If it's not done by the private sector after the initiatives that were passed that said you have to put any tax increase on the ballot, it's up to the voters, and I --

MORRIS: Right.

STANTON: Yeah, it makes sense.

PRIDEMORE: I guess I had a related comment on your opening statements to Randy regarding the 1994. You seem to suggest that because the Board underestimated the growth that actually occurred that that was the cause of traffic congestion and those kinds of problems, and trying to recollect here it seems that the County planned adequately for the capital facilities but that it could not afford to actually build the capital facilities, that's how we ended up with things like Pipeline One and other mechanisms trying to figure out how do we pay for this.

PRINTZ: I was part of Pipeline (inaudible) One, but, yeah, I guess my, my, and you and I

have had this conversation a number of times, my view of that is that two things: One, the capital facilities plan that we did then and that actually that we have today is, is not, is not sufficient. And the reason that it's not sufficient in a planning sense because it does not, it does not accurately predict the funding sources and availability of capital to those projects. We've got a 20-year plan, we are only required essentially to show -- we're supposed to show 6 years worth of financing, of which 3 years we actually have the money for. And so you're sort of down to 3 years out of 17 and the rest of the time most of what you see is grant, grant, grant, you have a -- you make these funding assumptions and they're made assuming that good things are going to happen in the Legislature and, and that we are going to receive money on a historic basis and we simply haven't done that.

And so my view of things is that, number one, that we had more people come here than we predicted which caused a problem, and, two, we didn't have an adequate capital facilities plan. And that, you know, that would have cost more money, there's no question, and that we as a community have -- I mean one of two things have to happen, either we continue what we've done since '94, which is to line up on both sides of the fence and shoot at each other and either try to stop growth, which isn't going to happen, or end up with messed up capital facilities on a variety of fronts and an increasingly deteriorating urban environment, or the community says, all right, we're going to have more folks are going to come here, I'm going to quit trying to determine or control who or how many people come here, we're simply going to now look at how are we going to fund what is going to come here and we are either going to do that through, you know, through gas taxes or some public financing mechanism that's spread across the board for the community. Those are our only two, those are the two realistic choices. The second one is, well, politically difficult, probably much more politically difficult than the first is by far the better solution.

MORRIS: Well, let me suggest there is a third and it is the one that will be the road taken when all is said and done, and that is that we will as the City of Ridgefield has done state right out in our capital facilities plans that the private sector is going to pay for this improvement and we're not going to put a penny in it, and absent that private sector participation, it won't get built. And I think that that is much more likely to be the long-term approach because the County, the jurisdiction's hands have effectively been tied in regards to any unilateral fiscal solution to these issues. The voters are unlikely -- it is very easy to persuade voters that all of the new people should pay for all of their responsibility and so that is why we may as well face that and put it in our capital facilities plans from the front. We have ability to do a significantly greater amount of that than school districts do because the school districts must by statute depend on State funding so.

PRINTZ: The problem with that solution is that many people will, will look at that or hear that and say okay, well, that's great because either, you know, the property owner or the private, the private sector pays for it or growth stops, one of the two. So either way it's sort of a win/win, either we don't get any more growth or we get the facilities that we need. Unfortunately that's not what GMA let's you do. What GMA --

MORRIS: Oh, yes, it does. Now I'm going, I'm going to claim a little authority here on GMA because I was a part of that legislative history that you refer to. Yes, it does not say in GMA that we are required to show our capacity to fully fund public expense.

PRINTZ: No, you didn't let me finish though.

MORRIS: I'm sorry. My apologies.

PRINTZ: No, that's all right. What it does though is GMA says you, you have to plan for the folks that are going to come here. You've picked a number and that that's the number that we are, you know, we are legally going to plan for. And it says you've got to provide capital facilities, but what it doesn't tell you is what level-of-service you're going to provide and the community gets to pick what that is. And they unfortunately get to pick that through their pocketbook. And you can say zero for the public side and developer financed for the rest, the level-of-service that you're going to obtain for that amount of private dollars is going to be significantly lower than what it is today. It doesn't mean that people don't come here anymore, it just means that the level of the service that they receive, particularly on the transportation side, are substantially lower and that's the problem, that's my problem with that, with that scenario.

MORRIS: I would have a problem with that scenario if I were you too.

PRINTZ: Thank you very much.

PRIDEMORE: If I could finish the comments I had started. The urban holding discussion has been out there for a long time and just so it's clear at the beginning of the hearing here, I'm not particularly enamored of the idea of urban holding, there may be some select areas where it's appropriate and where it makes sense, but I'm not jumping on the big band wagon on it. I know the mixed use ordinance has been something we've gone around and around. If, you think of focus group, I keep thinking of a task force coming together and if there, actually there is an expectation that developers and neighbors could sit down and actually work out something that everybody would embrace, I would welcome going forward with that process. I'm a little skeptical I guess.

PRINTZ: Everybody is, is not going to happen, but my view if we can bring you, if some, you know, however you want to characterize it, bipartisan group, small group, could bring you something that would be acceptable to, you know, 75 or 80 percent of the people who care about the issue, that, to me that, that's, that's, that's pretty good. I'm not going to give you any farther than that. I don't care who's on the committee, they're probably not going to get you farther than that. But I do think that -- I mean mixed use is not a bad thing and it can be done. And the ideas of mixed use whether they're vertical or horizontal depending on -- they all depend on the market, they all depend on the neighborhood, they all depend on a whole bunch of things, and if you, if you truly want mixed use to happen, then the private side has to be able to have significant input into how it actually gets done on the ground and whether or

not the market will support it or not. We're kind of going through this on it with Evergreen Airport with the City right now with (inaudible) and we're going to get there and we're going to end up with a good project, but it's going to be because it -- we're going to have to find something that the City in that case likes and that the market will accept. And that is, you know, that's not something I don't think that you can just one person can do, you need more input and that's my suggestion. The current ordinance clearly doesn't get you there.

PRIDEMORE: I'd have to see how that rolls out. The last thing was on the Hinton piece that you had talked about. We had substantial testimony in opposition to that and a lot of things about the critical lands --

PRINTZ: Right.

PRIDEMORE: -- you know, several months ago now. I know that the neighbors are sitting down with Battle Ground School District which also has an interest in the area to try to do some, initiate some process for how everybody's concerns can be addressed. I don't know if you guys are in that process or if you would welcome being involved in that process.

PRINTZ: We would certainly be happy to be involved in that process. The Battle Ground issue whether the population is up in Battle Ground or it's down farther south, it's still in the school district. That's I'm probably too thick to understand the issue but I haven't. The issue between whether or not we get done we put more people to the south that somehow is worse for the Battle Ground School District than if we put them farther up into Battle Ground doesn't make any sense to me because they're all in the district, the same district. So, but we would be, we'd be happy to sit down with them.

The issues from the neighbors for the most part were based entirely on critical area issues and there is one tiny little corner, the southwest corner of that property, and if you've gone out and looked at that, I mean 98 percent of that piece of property is relatively flat and it's a hay field right now, and it's bordered by the UGA on two sides and has urban services to it. 179th Interchange has a great deal of capacity in large part thanks to the Amphitheater, most, you know, for all but --

MORRIS: For the time being.

PRINTZ: -- 20 nights a year and without -- with 219th going in that interchange will actually add even more capacity so it is a good place to put some additional stuff.

MORRIS: I'm going to just add on the Hinton property that the Hinton development has been invited to participate in those discussions.

PRINTZ: May I go?

MORRIS: Absolutely.

PRINTZ: It's odd when I ask that question I know, usually --

STANTON: It's usually voluntarily.

MORRIS: Thank you for coming today.

PRINTZ: Thank you very much.

MORRIS: Mr. Horenstein.

HORENSTEIN: For the record Steve Horenstein, 500 Broadway, Suite 400, a new strategy on the Board's part, beat the lawyers down, very good, I like that. Let me start with mixed use because that was the most recent thing you discussed. We have had plenty and tortured experience with mixed use from downtown Vancouver all the way to the Ridgefield Junction, and let me just agree with the idea of a task force that works it out, let's make sure we have current planning staff on that, on that, we don't, we don't normally have (inaudible) staff people on those kinds of committees, but they struggle with this and I think it would be very good to add that to the mix.

PRIDEMORE: Are you talking about them being part of the task force --

HORENSTEIN: Part of the task force, yeah.

PRIDEMORE: -- as opposed to being the support to the task force?

HORENSTEIN: Yeah. People at say Susan Ellinger's level for example, yeah, very important I think maybe that team leaders at least do that because they struggle with it too. They try hard but they struggle with it.

Mixed use is working very well in downtown. We've been involved in four of them over the last 12, 15 years and they're working. The market is slowing down, the filling up the Vancouver Center building, but it's happening slowly but surely and it's going to work. And if you look at starting with Murdock and you look at what is now Riverview Tower and you look at West Coast Bank building, the residential in those buildings has gone faster than the office space and the retail space in virtually every one and we can see that happening in Vancouver Center as well, ultimately the rest fills up. And that's a true urban mixed use, a textbook kind of no brainer mixed use and there are developers obviously willing to do it and can make it work.

The other end of the spectrum is Hazel Dell Towne Center which although we now have the Target store opened, it was a very tortured project. We are still a long ways away from making the mixed use truly work on that site and I suspect it will. We had the first developer spend a million dollars on planning and engineering and architects and traffic and engineering

and all that stuff and now the second one developer is approaching that and it's a very tortured project and I believe we should treat large parcels like that a little more like we treat Columbia Tech Center then and not try to fit it into a mixed use ordinance but in a broad master planned ordinance where you have percentages of use but you're trying to -- don't try to put one on top of the other and you let the, let the planning staff, the current planning staff, work with developers to figure out how to lay out those properties so that you get the mix of uses but don't be, don't try to be quite so regulatory about it and have much more of a planning view of it, if that makes sense.

I think the same thing is happening to a certain extent at the Ridgefield Junction. I mean it's silly to have a mixed use ordinance out there that requires residential develop on the top of commercial development. I mean it's about as suburban as you can get and that's a product that will (inaudible) work there and we'll see how that's going to play out, but you really have to distinguish between true urban mixed use and true and larger suburban parcels that should be master planned but not in the same, not in the same way. I agree with everything else Randy said on the mixed use so I'd like to move on to urban holding.

I also agree with everything he said about urban holding. I think he did a wonderful job of laying out the issues. I don't think -- he did mention a political no win situation, I don't think it's going to get to a political no win because I 100 percent agree with him that it won't be legally defensible at the end of the day. You know, curiously, and you'll be surprised I'm going to say this, but I don't think there are a lot of legal issues that are appealable out of this plan because the things such as population, the population projection you've chosen, you could do it because it's in the range, that's not an appealable issue. The jobs to housing balance that some are complaining of, I know the Chamber in particular has a lot of concern about that, I'm not sure that's an appealable issue because I don't think it's a criteria. It ought to be but it isn't. So at the end of the day there are some things I suppose that could be appealed, but I don't think very many like last time.

This one I think would get turned around very quickly by the Hearings Board and I was sitting here while Randy was thinking trying to figure out, well, what do you have if you turn that over because the land is now free from urban holding designation but perhaps not in, but not in many cases there aren't capital facilities to serve it, so are you just leaving to the next Board a do over just to, just to continuum a do over as time goes along. I don't think, Commissioner Morris, that the issue of including the private sector contribution into all capital facilities plans, I believe Ridgefield was the only one that did that, at least the last time I looked.

MORRIS: Yes.

HORENSTEIN: I don't believe it's quite as black and white as you put it. I mean the jurisdictions do have some money. The jurisdictions have the ability to allocate money where private sector money might go and coincidentally that those are going to be the most likely places that the market will drive develop it and the market is pretty much left out of this process. And I'm not sure that this would look so dire if we did include the private sector in

the other plans and I don't understand why we haven't done that. It just -- I mean I could understand it if you were, if, if no growths were in charge of this plan, but that's not what we have here, we have staff trying to make this work and I do not understand why we don't include the private sector contribution because I think in many of the important market driven areas we would have the dollars to do the capital facilities then, that would be a much more enlightened view than an urban holding designation. Now you've heard from two of us who believe it will get flipped around pretty quick. Mr. Lowry may have another view, I haven't talked to him about it.

MORRIS: Just to comment, Mr. Horenstein, I think that was the point I was making because we as yet have not included the private sector participation as a significant part of our --

HORENSTEIN: Can you tell me why that is?

MORRIS: No.

HORENSTEIN: I don't believe there's a legal constraint on it.

MORRIS: No, there isn't. I did ask Mr. Lee about that again on Friday but it was difficult to discern the answer. We might ask now.

HORENSTEIN: Okay. I should have called you on the phone, Pat, sorry.

LEE: That's all right.

MORRIS: You don't need to pursue it right now if you'd prefer to do it later.

HORENSTEIN: Okay. Well, my view is that's what we ought to do and I think the plan would work much better than we might think because what you interact with that sort of thing is a market driven approach to where development will occur, that's probably where you want it to occur anyway because it's serving real people.

STANTON: I guess I need a better definition of the private sector payments. I thought the system development charges were incorporated in here in most of them, that that's the way --

MORRIS: They are except for ours on transportation as far as I can tell. And if it is simply a method of presentation and costs have been as I understood your E-mail this morning, you actually reduce costs that would have been reflected but I'm not sure that that's --

HORENSTEIN: Well, let me give a good example.

MORRIS: -- discernable.

STANTON: Impact fees and system development charges are incorporated.

HORENSTEIN: Well, let me give you a good example. The system development charges, the impact fees, will not deliver sewer to the Ridgefield Junction, but when you have a development the size of Union Ridge and perhaps a few others, other smaller that are on the west side of the freeway, you're going to get the sewer out there because the market drives the size of the development and the bigger the development, the more it can afford.

STANTON: So how can we predict that accurately?

HORENSTEIN: Well, I think the plan might have to have paid a little more attention to that than it did, but it's not hard to figure out where the market is going these days.

PRIDEMORE: Well, it may be that that's -- that we need to include that. I mean if I take the point we do have within the calculations we do make an estimate of impact fees and those sorts of contributions as these kind of one-on-one developer agreements that come up. We've talked in the past about what percentage the private sector pays for facilities today, the bulk of those expenditures are on things like internal roads, subdivision roads, those sorts of things that the public doesn't pay for but does begin to pay to maintain. So there's a, you know, and we've talked before about the biowave of when does that maintenance expense start to hit all of those things. These larger kind of private sector involvements, and I know Pipeline One was horrible because I sat and watched it, but those kinds of agreements could potentially become more necessary in the future if I understand Commissioner Morris' point and I don't know how we go about estimating that at this point.

MORRIS: Well, I want to elaborate, and I'll go and get it again when we have a break, but some months past Evan Dust did produce a document for us that showed over 60 percent of arterials as well as collectors are paid for by the -- are underwritten by the private sector. So I'm happy to dig that out and have copies made for all of us once more, but what I'm referring to are instances where one of the reasons why Mr. Horenstein was persuasive on including some of the land he wanted at 119th and 117th was because he said we'll fix the intersection. I think that's really what I'm referring to.

HORENSTEIN: Well, and, Judie, to get to your question a little more, if you think about it, it isn't really hard to figure out where this, where this will happen. There are really two kinds of things, there's a group of smaller developments that will require a Pipeline sort of approach and then there are larger developments. So let's take the Birtcher site for example. Been there forever, we have wanted that since before the first plan to become an industrial park. The developer contributions to that, to that development are huge in proportion to what you can require, but you have enough critical mass and you've created a little bit of retail commercial which helps pay for it. Well, maybe not a little bit but 20 percent of the site perhaps. Developers in conjunction with current planning staff find ways to make those work. It's happening at the Ridgefield Junction and I think it will if you let it happen at 179th, I think it could happen all along the Discovery Corridor if you let it. I'm going to talk about that in a minute as well, but if you think about where we are naturally expecting a significant

development to occur, I think in most all of those cases if you let it, the market, work a little differently than you are instead of assume that it won't get paid for, things will happen. It's much harder to do it with a group of smaller developers. I don't know anybody that was involved in Pipeline that wants to do that again, but on the other hand if the market wants it bad enough, it will happen again so. And we've learned some lessons about how to do it better and I think we are too afraid to let the market work. At the end of the day that's what drives development, the market. I have a couple of sites that I believe you won't have to put urban holding on when I show you what the infrastructure looks like, and I'll get to that in a minute.

And I think I'll move on from urban holding. Again incorporating everything Randy said, I think his analysis was a hundred percent. Let me talk about the Discovery Corridor for a minute. I gave -- we have a little technical glitch on our side, I gave, Randy and I met with two of the three of you each individually and providing you a map for the, with the proposed Discovery Corridor. Betty Sue, I think I failed to get a map to you and I --

MORRIS: I didn't see one.

HORENSTEIN: -- I apologize and we'll get that to you this afternoon. In fact we'll bring new ones and one for the record. The CREDC had some sense that maybe there was again some interest in moving that, the corridor, forward in some sort of way and put a quick task force together of five or six people, and Randy and I served on that, and some great work was done by Jerry Olson just on his own dime to identify where you could really do a Discovery Corridor and make it work clustered around each of the intersections from 179th to the La Center Junction and we would strongly commend that you reconsider that. I read a paper that Bart Philips wrote recently on for the EDC, it's their view that although we have the largest supply of raw acreage of industrial land in the metro area the, it is severely constrained, 58 percent of the total acreage is severely constrained by wetlands and other kinds of critical areas. It ain't what it looks like. It isn't going to service well and it is not certainly a lot of it ready to go. It is so clear that you could do a very carefully constructed Discovery Corridor moving again from south to north all the way to La Center and create land that is also constrained, but in many cases not as constrained and it would do a much better job of, one, ensuring we have true inventory that we can, we can use, and, number two, put it in places that it likely, is likely to be utilized because of the transportation infrastructure, its proximity to cities in a couple of cases and certainly the most developable of our industrial property is going to be along the, the Interstate.

This proposal is not for mixed use, it's not for commercial, it's for true industrial with whatever kinds of constraints you choose to put on it to make sure that it remains true industrial. Should you have some limitation on distribution centers, probably so because we don't want it all used up for that purpose. Although there's plenty of need for distribution centers, we should have some limitation on that. That is an area contradicting myself that you should bring in and put an urban holding on while we figure out what its, what its development use constraints are and how it is, how the transportation infrastructure will be

developed. I don't think putting it in urban reserve does any good. In fact I think you're better off not doing that frankly than putting it in. They're all largely large parcels, it's not going to -- nothing there will develop unless and until it's been, it's, it's included in urban growth boundaries and made urban land for industrial development. So on behalf of the task force and myself I would encourage you to do that. And I will get you those maps. Any questions about that?

STANTON: Well, I guess just some more comments. I don't know if you've talked to Cities about their opinion of Discovery Corridor, but we had some pretty loud voices in opposition to it with the idea that you needed to put the commercial, industrial, the jobs, within the cities where the residences are. Again it's about money as Commissioner Morris brought out earlier, who's going to benefit from it. She led a task force or a group of elected officials through a long tortured discussion about revenue sharing, how you could develop that corridor and then figure out how you share the revenues from it. The other concern about that is just revenue sharing between school districts. It's virtually all in the Ridgefield School District, a windfall for them, but certainly the employees would wind up locating in other school districts. And then your point about it staying truly industrial I would have agreed with because I do agree with the Discovery Corridor concept, the approach, but the experience of watching Ridgefield go through a decision to allow mixed use on industrial zoned land kind of led me in another direction, especially because it was so supported by CREDC and others so.

HORENSTEIN: Yeah, CREDC did not support what was done at the Ridgefield Junction, Bart testified that in strong opposition to it.

STANTON: They changed their policy on no net loss though to approach the idea of allowing mixed use on industrially zoned land. They did do that?

HORENSTEIN: They did. I was on that task force, it's not very strong.

STANTON: Yeah. So those are the problems that I see with it right now.

HORENSTEIN: Well, Commissioner Stanton, frankly Vancouver doesn't want it for themselves and they don't want anybody else to have it. Battle Ground is doing a job of trying to do a pretty good job of getting some for itself, but it doesn't want anybody else to have it. I mean what is going to be different five years from now when we do this process again, they still aren't going to want it, it's never going to be close enough to a city to annex, so when would we do that if it's a good idea.

STANTON: Hopefully the idea of the revenue sharing discussions will age a little bit and some of those discussions will be beneficial. I think La Center has actually asked us to engage in that discussion with them.

HORENSTEIN: My view of revenue sharing is if you put the dirt in the boundary and in the

various boundaries, all of a sudden the revenue sharing discussions would get a little easier. I don't think you're ever going to be able to do it, and I apologize for seeming a little bit skeptical about it, but I think if it's reality, then people are going to come to the table to get their share as opposed to, as opposed to not. I have -- if there are no other comments on any of those.

MORRIS: I do.

HORENSTEIN: I'm sorry.

MORRIS: I have some legal questions for you because this is sort of intriguing. Commissioner Stanton is absolutely correct about the difficulties with the revenue sharing discussion. The more difficult one to solve is the school district discussion.

HORENSTEIN: I agree.

MORRIS: However, I also agree with you and am reminded that you can lead a horse to water but you can't make him drink, the trick is to make him thirsty before they get there.

HORENSTEIN: Right.

MORRIS: I would actually like for you not to give a quick response to this unless your answer is a flat out no, not in a thousand years, if you could perhaps noodle for a while and then comment later in the day, a couple of different approaches to achieve this, GMA does allow us to establish entirely new urban areas outside of any other area.

HORENSTEIN: Not connected to a --

MORRIS: Not connected.

HORENSTEIN: Right.

MORRIS: Now I'm not sure what all of your requirements in that, but I do know that you are allowed to do that. If we were to, if we were to try some really creative legal and planning thought and design some sort of an area where you could include not only in your holding area discussions infrastructure but also revenue sharing, is it possible to have that kind of an element included in that, in the ordinance itself, can we -- do we have that authority under our legislative jurisdiction?

HORENSTEIN: Well, the issue --

MORRIS: It's not a -- excuse me.

HORENSTEIN: Yeah, I'll raise the question but I won't answer the -- your question.

MORRIS: Good. Thank you.

HORENSTEIN: The question in my mind is the one Commissioner Stanton raises that I agree with you'd be creating a windfall to the Ridgefield School District when it wouldn't need that much of a windfall because you -- we aren't going to create houses if we do what we request, we put, we create jobs, and I'm not aware in my work for the school districts over time how you can -- whether you can allocate revenue from one to another through revenue sharing.

MORRIS: But for the cities could you do it?

HORENSTEIN: Oh, I think so, but let me think about that.

MORRIS: Okay, thank you.

HORENSTEIN: Yeah. My answer's not hell no, it's a I'll think about it a little bit.

MORRIS: Okay. And then later on it will be. Okay, thank you.

HORENSTEIN: Okay. Let me just do a few site-specific requests if I might. I brought somebody much better looking than Evan too to run the projector.

MORRIS: Oh, I don't know.

HORENSTEIN: I'd like to start with the Rick Bowler, the Lear property in Battle Ground. And we'll give you individual packets on each of these and for the record. We spent -- Joe and I spent a long evening watching Battle Ground struggle with taking out Meadow Glade and proposing what now appears to be shown on your map, and we commend them for doing it, it was not an easy discussion for them and I thought they did a good job of spending three hours trying to figure out what to do, some recognition that they don't have as much capital facilities plans as their appetite is for dirt. The other thing that I think they did that was smart in addition to taking Meadow Glade out was to draw a line down the, down the west side of I-5. Can you point to that with your finger, Jo, where we're talking there, yeah, that line there does allow to have -- allow development to occur on both sides of I-5. I'm sorry not I-5 --

STANTON: You're to 503.

HORENSTEIN: -- 503 because it doesn't make sense to stop the urban growth boundary at one side of that, of that major arterial there. The particular piece we are interested in is, if you'll show it with your pen there, Jo, is that piece there proposing for commercial development. This is a good example of what I was discussing before. The sewer and water extension to that site is a fair bit away and we have a developer who has said to the City we'll bring it down there if, if that land goes in the boundary. A sophisticated developer who I

think is understands some of the constraints that's, that this County's had providing services, and our proposal is to support the map as Battle Ground has proposed it to you and is shown on your new map and make that particular parcel, show it on this one too, Jo, if you would please, make that particular parcel commercial there.

STANTON: Now wait. Are you talking about beyond what's red, the thing that's inside the felt pen there?

HORENSTEIN: No, just the red part.

FOLKERTS: This is to be urban residential and the red commercial.

HORENSTEIN: Yeah. Yeah.

MORRIS: Okay. That the piece to the west of the red appears to already be subdivided. Are there existing houses?

HORENSTEIN: There's a couple of houses, there's a few houses, two or three houses on it, but it will probably be largely redeveloped.

STANTON: I think that's where the Moons are.

HORENSTEIN: Who now?

STANTON: The Moons --

HORENSTEIN: Yes.

STANTON: -- that we've heard from frequently.

LEE: Yes.

HORENSTEIN: That's correct. That's correct. Any questions on that one?

LEE: I would just point out that actually the Battle Ground proposal in terms of the land use and our proposal are not the same, that that is shown on our January 14th map as I believe industrial.

STANTON: Yes.

LEE: Yes. Not the commercial that Battle Ground is now portraying on their map.

HORENSTEIN: No, but I didn't realize that, but it makes no sense as industrial with the homes through there, it's not that big of a piece, it's a much better place, piece for commercial

that's right on the, right on the intersection. If there are no questions about that, I'd like to move to the Bowyer property.

This is the Par 3 Golf Course along 119th and 117th and I know that it shows on the most recent map as in the boundary and I -- we thank you for that. I wanted to talk to you a little bit about, about the service ability of this site. This is a site that is it is not necessary to put in urban holding. We will provide you with an analysis from both Olson Engineer and Kittelson & Associates indicating that services are present and that the transportation capacity is there and that without too much effort can be improved to serve probably more than the site with the -- just based on what the developer could afford to do at that location. 503 is very well improved through there, but there would have to be some additional work done, and of course some fairly significant work done on 119th. And Hazel Dell Sewer District is close by and water is there very close by as well. So this is a good example of a site that -- I know Vancouver doesn't want to move the urban growth boundary out that far and therefore would like to control it through, through urban holding, but it just isn't necessary, the criteria couldn't be sustained on this site because services are readily available.

If there are no questions on this one I'd like to move to the two Parker sites which are down 119th to the east. And I have a question for Pat on this. It appears to me from your map, Pat, that you're changing the density designation on the Parker site?

PRIDEMORE: They were given direction by the Board to try to figure out how we've reached our density goals and Pat brought this (inaudible).

HORENSTEIN: Yeah, I appreciate that.

LEE: Yeah. The map we reviewed this morning increases it from I think what was on the January map of R1-6 to R1-5.

HORENSTEIN: Okay, that's much of a change overall. We could support that. And again we'll submit to you information on these two parcels together very similar letters from Olson Engineering and Kittelson & Associates showing that these sites can be adequately served today with some cost to the developer, but the cost is proportional to the -- that to what the development can afford for that site. So again a couple of good examples of where --

STANTON: That is in the area that Hazel Dell Sewer District testified and sent us a letter saying it would be more difficult to serve.

HORENSTEIN: Well, this is Olson Engineering has determined for them that as long as we pay for it, we can bring it up there. It gets back to what we discussed before. The developer will pay to bring it forward. It's just hard for me to understand how we could leave that out of the equation. I mean here's a perfect example of where -- it's a little ways away, but the site development will justify the expense of bringing it forward, why is that not in everybody's best interest if we meet the density there. I mean we just raised the density, you have it on

your January 14th map, it's -- you've now increased the density, Hazel Dell Sewer District has said to us if you want to pay for it, we'll let you bring it up there, it's in their district.

MORRIS: Is that in the packet of information you gave us?

HORENSTEIN: Yes.

FOLKERTS: Not Hazel Dell.

HORENSTEIN: No. Well, it's Olson's. There's some -- it's not from Hazel Dell, it's from Olson Engineering who, who did the due diligence for us.

MORRIS: Okay, thank you.

HORENSTEIN: Yeah. I'd like to talk about the Bill Rohrer property which is something that is not on the current map, although it does show on the Ridgefield map, and we're handing out maps I believe now, a memo. This one's easy to see on the map, it's over on the very on my right-hand side with the big -- just give her -- I'll give her a minute here to catch up.

MORRIS: It helps to have them come one at a time.

HORENSTEIN: Yeah, it does. I don't know if you'd rather have it all in the a notebook or rather get them one at a time so.

MORRIS: No, this works well after this morning.

STANTON: Well, actually, no, wait a second. Are there two Parkers?

MORRIS: Yes.

HORENSTEIN: Yes.

MORRIS: She gave us two Parkers. So the first Parker you throw away.

STANTON: But they're two different ones, one's Rosemary and one's James.

HORENSTEIN: Right. And they're adjacent parcels, one's south--

STANTON: So don't throw it away, that's a separate one.

HORENSTEIN: You have brought them all in as one but there are two parcels, there are two owners there. James Parker's piece is the piece that gives that whole area a connection to 119th. The map identifies the Mt. View Dairy and Mr. Rohrer's property. It's adjacent to a proposed urban growth boundary expansion designated for future business park per your, your

map of January 14th of this year. It's our request is for inclusion of the adjacent parcel into the urban growth boundary. If you really have trouble with that, we would take urban reserve but we'd really like you to bring it in as a logical extension to of the site that is immediately to its west which is on the map. Both of these sites have been proposed by Ridgefield going back to 2002 and there will be activity on that adjacent piece and it just seems logical to include those two together.

MORRIS: Isn't that what's referred to as the Walker property immediately to the north?

HORENSTEIN: Yes.

MORRIS: Thank you.

HORENSTEIN: And there is activity on that property now. And I'd like to talk for a minute about Art Waldal's property again. I sound like -- a little bit like a broken record on this one. This is a piece that is designated for industrial in the Battle Ground urban growth boundary and it is located where the arrow is at the very top of the map on the screen. Do we have the map that shows the residential development just to the south of it with us? The -- you can see residential development moving its way north there. Mr. Waldal has developed some of that. He is in for approval on the parts to the, just to the south I believe for residential development and would like to continue to proceed north. The property next to it is property that is being acquired by the Battle Ground School District for a school site. There's also I believe a PUD tower there, can't remember that, and when you go out there and look at it it's really -- would really be isolated from any other commercial development of any sort. It is housing all the way around it out there and there will be a school right next to it. When you go across the street there isn't much development, it's a very up and down road, very difficult to, wouldn't -- you couldn't straighten it out. It's a rural road that would, that would, just wouldn't be attractive to industrial users. Perhaps you can trade this piece for the piece Randy asked you to make industrial it occurs to me that just listening to him and we wouldn't have any less acreage. Jo, how big is this piece? Do you remember?

FOLKERTS: 40.

HORENSTEIN: 40. And I believe the Gramor piece is at least 40, maybe bigger than that, but it just, this just is not a good site for industrial development. I mean it's one of those things you can put it on the map and say, gee, I've got a 40-acre piece here, but it isn't going to develop that way, it's surrounded by houses, it's going to have a school immediately to its east and it doesn't have transportation infrastructure that would support it. Battle Ground I guess is not taking up their final map until September so I guess they don't get much input into this.

STANTON: I was going to ask you --

MORRIS: We'll be through by then.

STANTON: -- if you had been to City Council what they think about this proposal.

HORENSTEIN: I tried. I thought I was going to talk about it on the night that we talked about the piece on 503 that I previously mentioned, but that's all they were focused on was what were they taking out of the boundary. And they're holding a hearing on September to deal with their urban growth boundary, so I guess I need your cooperation because it's going to be too late when they do it.

MORRIS: We hope we're through by then.

HORENSTEIN: I do too. I only have one other site to talk about and that's the Circle C site. It's my vast preference that you do the Discovery Corridor which would include that site. I'm not getting real good vibes about the possibility of that in this round. I would like you then to consider our prior request to include the Circle C site, 148 acres just east and slightly south of the intersection at the La Center Junction. The site is ultimately developable, it has an 8-acre landfill on it that has now been delisted from the (inaudible) site, it's just in its final phases of monitoring. It only takes up 8 acres of this parcel, but it is almost as you can see through the intersection there and we have proposed as you will recall that we develop under the rural industrial land, land bank section of the rural industrial land ordinance that was provided at -- that was approved by the Legislature a couple of years ago essentially at Clark County's request. The -- Bill Fromhold carried the water and it took him two years to get it done. It was driven by our County primarily and initially, it's there. If we don't begin to use it before the -- on that particular site by the end of 2007 it goes away. And it's, it's an excellent site for industrial development and we would propose it for true industrial development.

That statute is very restrictive on what it can be used for. It only allows a very minor amount of commercial to serve the site. It's very clear in the statute that it is not designed to serve regional shoppers for retail, it's just delis, that sort of thing that you can put there, it would be very much like Columbia Business Park is. Do we need the inventory, yes, for the reasons I said before. We've got quite a bit of land and half of it's usable or less than half of it is usable. This is a logical site to do this. Ultimately it would come in the La Center urban growth boundary and be tax base for them and I would again ask you to consider this and make a decision to allow us to at least anchor the north end of the Discovery Corridor under the statute, under the rural land statute.

PRIDEMORE: I didn't get the chance to ask you earlier, Steve, did you have a chance to review the interchange policy that's being proposed?

HORENSTEIN: For that section? For that --

PRIDEMORE: No, just in general. We have an interchange policy that would impact the entire corridor.

HORENSTEIN: No, I have not. What is it, what is, what is your concern as it relates to this

proposal?

PRIDEMORE: Well, it's fairly restrictive about what can happen within a half mile of an interchange so it seems like a good idea. Because if we're going to go forward with that, it would be good to have your input on what impact it could have on the things you're talking about.

HORENSTEIN: Okay. I can do that and how would that work procedurally? Well, what, do you know what it says?

MORRIS: Isn't that only for new interchanges?

STANTON: No.

MORRIS: No?

LEE: No, it's triggered by any major investment as described in the ordinance whether it's an existing or a new interchange.

HORENSTEIN: Is that on the Web site, Pat?

LEE: Yeah. Oh, well, yeah, it should be in the code, you know --

PRIDEMORE: We could even have somebody --

LEE: -- we certainly can get you a copy right now.

HORENSTEIN: You've adopted it?

PRIDEMORE: -- get that for you. We haven't adopted it yet --

MORRIS: No.

PRIDEMORE: -- it's part of the comp plan text changes.

HORENSTEIN: Okay. Well, let me take a look at it and I'll get back to you this afternoon if you like.

PRIDEMORE: I'd appreciate it because I think it could have a pretty big impact.

HORENSTEIN: Yeah, okay.

PRIDEMORE: The other thing on what you said earlier regarding the mixed use and the urban kind of nonurban style --

HORENSTEIN: Yeah.

PRIDEMORE: -- my concern with it and departing too far from having similar requirements is that if these develop in, you know, a version of mixed use that is not consistent with my vision of mixed use, it's going to be like that for 50, 100 years before anybody's going to be in any position to go through and redevelop it so and then it would likely only occur with fairly heavy taxpayer subsidies like the mixed use that I like to see down here.

HORENSTEIN: I'm not tracking with you, I'm sorry.

PRIDEMORE: Well, it's take the Hazel Dell Towne Center site, okay, which you know was not compatible with my definition of "mixed use."

HORENSTEIN: No.

PRIDEMORE: It wasn't vertical, it wasn't urban as you've defined it.

HORENSTEIN: No. Correct. Right. Right.

PRIDEMORE: My concern is if we, if we go very far from those standards that the urban kind of mixed use that the area will go ahead and develop at a nonurban level but the urban development's going to creep around them anyway. I mean we will have that urban level of development, but when that occurs the site will already have been developed at this nonurban kind of criteria, that's my concern with it in getting too far.

HORENSTEIN: I understand that problem and again let's put that on the agenda for the task force that Randy suggested. He and I didn't talk about that, but I think that's a great idea because it's complicated. What we tend to leave out, especially on the mixed use, is what works for the market, what will people build. I mean it doesn't matter what our land use map says, if people won't build what it -- what is required when they look at it and say that's too expensive or that won't work there or there's no market for it there or, you know, then, then it doesn't mean, the map doesn't mean much so. I think this is the most complicated concept to make right than any of them.

PRIDEMORE: And I suspect it probably is. I mean certainly what we've heard. There's also the possibility that the market doesn't predict perfectly and that it's slow to respond to situations until they've seen demonstrated successes and --

HORENSTEIN: I think that's true. And I'll tell you where that's true right now in our market is with a lot of job creation land. It's certainly not true with retail because our population has gotten to the point that we're hungry for retail development so that's why you see all these retail developers around, it's a part of a cycle. And residential is of course continues to be okay. And so you make a good point. We have to think about it not just for what the market

is today but we have to think about it long-term, but we still have to locate things where ultimately when the market is right people will build them and I really would encourage us to maybe you designate the mixed use and that's one place you do put urban holding while we work it out and I'd be very happy to help with that.

PRIDEMORE: I really appreciate your suggestion that staff actually be on the task force (inaudible).

HORENSTEIN: Yeah, it's hard for them, and they try hard. Now I'm not being critical, I'm just saying they need, they need to participate for their own (inaudible).

PRIDEMORE: And when we've done these task forces in the past I think one of the reasons that we end up with proposals that we're not ready to adopt is the task force will make a recommendation and staff will find a whole lot of errors or at least concerns that weren't addressed adequately during the task force process, so actually having them engaged in the discussion and free to express their professional opinions I think would be real helpful.

HORENSTEIN: Well, that's one part of it is just sort of their technical expertise, but the other part of it is they've been trained as planners and they have opinions about this stuff and we ought to include those opinions in those conversations.

MORRIS: Well, I wanted to suggest particularly the development review staff because development review staff has never been included in any of our task forces, and I do know that when I had a little meeting on the home occupation ordinance and included a development review person, they were reading it entirely differently than the long-range planning staff had been crafting it.

HORENSTEIN: That's what I'm suggesting. I don't think it's as --

MORRIS: Right.

HORENSTEIN: -- I don't think it's that important to have long-range planners there, they've done their work and said this is where we're going to put it. Now what we're going to do with it is a current planning issue.

MORRIS: It's development review, right.

PRIDEMORE: Although do you end up kind of crossing the line between them being involved in development applications? I mean you would want specific applicants --

HORENSTEIN: There's no legal, there's no legal problem with that. Yeah. I think it's whatever problem might come from that I think it's worth it that you do it, it's more important to have them there. I have nothing else. Thank you.

MORRIS: Thank you. I think we'll take a very short break, give our stenographer's fingers a chance to rest.

(Pause in proceedings.)

MORRIS: Well, we'll resume our hearing on changes to our comprehensive land use plan. Mr. Howsley, you're next.

HOWSLEY: Thank you. For the record James Howsley, 500 East Broadway, Suite 400. First of all I'd like to thank the Board once again for allowing me to testify here before you and hopefully what will be the conclusion of this very long process. First of all, I've handed to the Board copies of a map and also some for the record which reflect all of the site-specific requests that the law firm of Miller/Nash has pending before this Board. I also believe that each of the Commissioners has individually received a much larger copy of this map and just if you didn't bring that today, this is just for your reference. The second thing that you should have received is like a little packet and it's basically a map of showing all of the requests that I'm going to be talking about before you today and there's about nine different areas that I'll be going over for that.

Just real briefly on the urban holding, I believe that Mr. Printz and Mr. Horenstein eloquently and thoroughly expressed my, my legal concerns with, with the holding ordinance. Again I kind of I see it as an appropriate place to put urban holding, especially around smaller cities where the cities are the service provider since they're the ones that are going to have to be extending, you know, sewer and water and so forth like Camas and Battle Ground and Ridgefield, that an urban holding zone would be appropriate because if they can't effectively serve it at that time, this would be some kind of basically waiting period until those properties could be served. On the Clark County urban growth area we've submitted evidence in the record and previous testimony about some of the properties I'll be discussing today that shows that these areas could be served currently by either private, quasi-private agencies like Hazel Dell Sewer District or the County rather than, rather than the City of Vancouver. So again just bear that in mind throughout this testimony.

And just, just beginning on the site-specifics, if you take the packet that I, I gave you today and I guess go back past Number One, the first property I'd like to talk about is the Bakker parcel. This request we put into the system back in 2000 and it's, it's also being made pursuant to a settlement agreement, again I'd like to remind the Board, between the County and our client from the Western Washington Growth Management Hearings Board and the County under this process is obligated to commit seriously and thoroughly to considering an alternative zoning to the current zoning of the property which is Ag-20. This property can be served very readily by sewer and water, although probably a pump station would be required and that's something that the developer would of course accommodate. It's also located at the terminus of the 192nd Avenue area. That areas as you, the Board, is well aware is going through a major road improvement project right now and could easily accommodate the amount of units that this development would eventually have. I believe that the Board in the

past has actually seen a proposal for this site, kind of it was a mixed, mixed density proposal that did include considerations for the environmental constraints that are on this site. The site has been delineated by Mr. Gross (phonetic) at the Resource Company and of course we would before any development that would go on that site stay out of those critical areas and provide the buffer that's required under the code. Is there any questions?

MORRIS: I don't remember the Hearings Board settlement, could you refresh my memory.

HOWSLEY: Yeah. Back in 1999, this I'm personally not familiar with the case as well, it was my father's case, basically back in 1999 the Bakker family had appealed to the Washington Growth Management Hearings Board a decision that was looking at basically rezoning the property from Ag-20 to R-5. At the time --

PRIDEMORE: It's this one and the McDonald, we had it under annual review in 2000.

STANTON: No, that Mrs. Bakker --

MORRIS: I remember now, thank you.

STANTON: -- and it came through on annual review and the request was to go from Ag to R-5, 5 acre.

PRIDEMORE: There was this one and McDonald.

HOWSLEY: This one and McDonald.

STANTON: Yeah. That was in Washougal, yeah.

PRIDEMORE: That's it.

HOWSLEY: Correct. And basically we or my father had dismissed the appeal subject to an agreement with the County that the County take a look at this during this update if that helps the Board.

The second property if you turn the tab, this one's located off of Ward Road and 162nd and we refer this to as the Germann property. This is a property that has a contingent purchase arrangement with Holt Homes. I believe that the Board in the past has also seen a proposed site plan for this property. One of the conditions of the sale to Holt Homes is actually you see a big green space in the middle of the proposed site plan, the Germanns are requiring a dedication of a park to be named in their parents honor, that's something that we would do as part of the development project and would be funded by the homeowner's association. Currently this -- these properties are not on the proposed expansion map. We would ask that the Board reconsider that for several reasons. One of the unique, one of the unique things about this property in relation to all the most of the rest of the properties that the Board has

looked at expanding is this actually sits in the Hockinson School District, not Battle Ground or Evergreen. So talking about impacts to school districts this, I think that this would have a, you know, have a lesser impact on Battle Ground or Evergreen.

Secondly, it's located off of Ward Road which is currently being upgraded as well as being proposed for other further transportation improvement projects. Thirdly, it's located next to Country Lane Acres and water and sewer is readily available. Kind of there to the southwest corner as you see those dots represent actual developed homes now that weren't there the last time the aerial was taken. And we have talked with the City of Vancouver Water and Sewer and they confirmed that, that the site easily be served by, by extending the lines.

MORRIS: What's the proposed zoning that you're asking for?

HOWSLEY: We had originally asked for R1-6. You know, we would be happy -- it looked like from today's discussion that staff was leaning towards looking at R1-5 for a lot of the expansion areas, we'd be fully happy with that.

Moving on. The third property is one located off of 179th Street. It's referred to as the Jochim property. This is also one that's under contingent purchase arrangement by Holt Homes. It was on the proposed alternative as R1-6 and as far as I could tell by today's map it is also showing as R1-6. This site I believe is in the Ridgefield School District and again as Randy Printz had testified earlier it's located off, you know, right off 179th Street that has adequate capacity for transportation, and sewer and water it would be Hazel Dell Sewer District sewer and they've confirmed that this would be an area that could readily be served. Is there any questions on this one?

The next, the next property is referred to as the Webb property and this one is also located off of 179th Street. Again, this one also is a -- the contingent purchaser is Holt Homes. I believe that Mr. Printz had testified earlier today about the Hinton parcel which I'm sure the Board is well aware of down there to the southwest of this property. This property currently does not show for inclusion in the urban growth boundary, but I think that there's some arguments that, that would lend some credence to the fact that it should be coming in. It's -- again it's located off of 179th Street. Currently on the County's current TIP I think it's project Number 15, there are scheduled improvements in widening of 179th Street from 32nd all the way to 50th Avenue and that calls for multiple lanes and again that would easily avail itself to any development up in this area. Also Hazel Dell Sewer District has confirmed that this area would be easy to serve due to its proximity to existing lines. And I'll be coming back to this area to discuss a little bit more the property to the north which is the Renaissance Homes parcel.

In the packet I'd like you to skip over one request due to, and I'll come back to it in a moment, just based on some of the changes that I saw this morning, so if you would please go to past Tab 8. This property is above Lacamas Park up in Camas. And again it's been reflected on all of the Board's alternatives thus far for R1-6. We currently are in discussions with the City

of Camas about annexing this property as well as the school district property directly to the west and as well as the high school site which is that, the other brown chunk up there. As part of that discussions we've talked about how to serve this site and we've basically figured out that, that we can do this through a development agreement to extend sewer and water and get the adequate transportation infrastructure that we need to get there and just would like to have the Board's continued support for this site. One other unique thing about it again is in order to help Camas reach its density targets, this site we had shown for a proposed master plan. And I think the Board has seen this, I don't know if we have a copy of that, again the proposed master plan, one of the -- two of the things it would do is it would help Camas reach its density target of six units an acre, the other thing it would do is have a multi-family component so it would also help Camas achieve its 25/75 percent difference. So just would ask the Board continuing on supporting this property.

LEE: James, can I ask a question about that. I think it's, was proposed as an R1-6.

HOWSLEY: Correct.

LEE: And are you suggesting it change to a different designation?

HOWSLEY: No, we're happy with the County's R1-6 because when it, when it comes into the city as part of the annexation, we'll go into City zoning at that point.

The next property is the May property. Again, this is one that is basically shown on all the alternatives for inclusion as commercial. This, this property is located at 192nd and 1st Street. It's a small 3-acre parcel and it's currently scheduled to go to C-2. We -- again we support the inclusion of this. This site can readily be served through adequate transportation infrastructure as the 192nd Street and 1st Street improvements are going forward as well as sewer and water are readily available to this site. Is there any questions about that one?

The next site is the Renaissance Homes request. That's again up at 179th Street. Do you have the letter? Oh, it's in the packet. Okay, just put up the map then. No, no, the map. Okay. Again, I know the Board has all individually seen this, this request again. If I may. In part of the packet is the site plan that you see before you. We've also provided a letter basically providing an analysis of what we expect the potential impact to the school district to be. Due to the nature of Renaissance they can pretty accurately predict who their buying target is and one of the things that this, this development would be focused on essentially would be empty-nester types, early retirees without children. Within that we've provided what we would expect the economic impact to be to the school district based upon that, that buyer profile type, with that you'd have an approximate average home cost, what the projected impact fees would be generated off of that, including any property taxes that would be an ongoing revenue source to the school district.

As far as the transportation infrastructure, again this, this property is across from the Webb property on 179th and 179th is currently scheduled for the improvements and widening from

32nd to 50th, so this, this seems like it would be a logical area where you'd want to focus growth since it's already scheduled for public investment. As far as water and sewer, again talking with Hazel Dell Sewer District this is an area that, that they have stated that they could readily serve, so this, this seems to be a really efficient place to, to look at expansion for, for residential land. Kind of finally, along with all the other, the other developments that the Board knows with the proposed thought of expanding Washington State University, with Legacy Hospital going in and several other large developments up in the Salmon Creek area, this would be kind of a logical area to house people, especially executives, given the type of builder that this is and what, what we would, we would look to do here. Is there any questions on this one?

And then the second to the last one is the Warman request. It's my understanding that Mayor Dennis was supposed to have come and testified before the Board on Green Mountain, but I believe that he's on vacation at this time so I'm kind of do this by proxy. I think that he had submitted a letter to the Board requesting inclusion of Green Mountain in the Camas urban growth area pursuant to their proposed comprehensive plan map which is what you see above. As part of the Green Mountain request there's one of our site-specific requests and that's Mr. Warman's request. Again, this property has two, two portions to it. The southerly long skinny portion on the south side of Ingle Road there is basically a private water ski lake and on the north side is Mr. Warman's current residence. Go to the other map. I know that the City of Camas in their request has looked for this area for proposed job expansion either under some kind of business park designation or some kind of mixed use designation and we would ask that if the Board is considering moving forward with the Camas' request to include Green Mountain that they include the Warman property but under the zoning of R1-6. And then finally going to the 119th Street area.

MORRIS: Again, could you try to line those up for --

HOWSLEY: Could you just cover the Lagler property. And, Evan, could you move up the other one. That's perfect. This is the first time that I'm sure that you guys have seen this map this morning, this is the first time that I've seen it. I was a little bit concerned when I saw it because there are -- it looked like there was some proposed zone changes on one of the, one of the sites that, that I'm representing. This property is the -- is referred to as the Zilke/Schoen request. It's property that's under contingent purchase agreement by Holt Homes.

MORRIS: This is tab number what?

HOWSLEY: I believe it's behind Tab Number 5. The Schoen property is that, that little blue finger that, that kind of jets out. The last time I was in front of the Board one of the things that I had suggested is is looking at amending this zoning to maybe some higher density residential to act as a buffer between that existing one-acre cluster subdivision or one acre it looks like development to the north and the business park that would be directly to the south. As part of that request, you know, I would ask that the Board look at that again as well. To the west of these we, we had submitted a request for R1-6. It looks like according to the latest

map that it shows as R1-5 on at least the north half of the property, we would be okay with that. On the southern half, for some reason again it looks like it's been changed to mixed, mixed use. We would ask that again that the Board reconsider that for either R1-5 or R1-6. The mixed use zone as you've heard Steve and Randy is extremely hard to kind of get, get our hands around at this point in terms of providing predictability to, to development. I know that the brown -- if you look on the bottom, the bottom map, the one that we handed out, the property is immediately to the west of ours with the mixed use designation. I believe that they actually requested mixed use as part of their site-specific review request and so that seems like it would be a logical place to go ahead and place that since they were requesting that originally.

MORRIS: And, Mr. Lee, can you -- the light up here is really bad and it's hard to see the parcel lines on the map you've produced over the weekend. I can't tell what it's been changed to by the color. Is it office business park? What's happened to this particular --

LEE: Yeah. The actual the office business park basically stayed the same from the January 14th map.

PRIDEMORE: You say it's gone from business park to an office?

MORRIS: Yeah.

LEE: But from -- well, the, no.

MORRIS: Are you interchanging? Well, it's gone from business park to office campus on the map I'm looking at for color.

LEE: Okay. Yeah, the color is, has changed there.

MORRIS: Is that what you meant?

LEE: I don't know that we had had a discussion of office campus versus BP necessarily so it could have just been, you know, we put the wrong color on that particular thing, so I would stick with the January proposal of business park. The other parcels that Mr. Howsley is talking about we did expand some of the mixed use into what was previously an R1-6 designation.

MORRIS: So part of what used to be R1-6 has become --

LEE: Mixed use. I think those are kind of the --

MORRIS: -- mixed use and R1-5; is that right?

HOWSLEY: I believe that's right.

LEE: Yes.

PRIDEMORE: What was the purpose for that, Pat? Did you get higher density out of the mixed use than you did out of R1-5?

LEE: I think it was mainly concern about, you know, possibly a smaller pocket of R1-5 between a business park and a, and a mixed use so we, we opted to expand the mixed use area. That's been, I mean that's been one of the more dynamic areas. As you go through the proceedings a lot of that whole area was business park going into the Planning Commission, then a lot of it was taken out as business park, and then we've changed from mixed use and various residential designations, so it's definitely -- I could understand James having a hard time keeping up with what's going on there because it has been an area that's gone through a lot of different changes. We did originally locate mixed use there as James indicated because we had a site-specific request looking for a couple of parcels of mixed use, but we did expand that beyond what the original request was.

HOWSLEY: Again, I think that the Board in the past also has seen a proposed site plan for this site as this site's also been delineated for critical areas specifically, there's some the wetlands out there. I think that given the nature of the wetlands and it being flat that it would be a little bit more conducive to single-family residential than trying to plunk some kind of commercial zoning in there that would create more impervious surface.

PRIDEMORE: Pat, I'm sorry, Pat, could you bring me up that chart that he put up there.

LEE: This one?

HOWSLEY: That one.

PRIDEMORE: No, that small one there.

MORRIS: That schematic, yeah. Look at that.

HOWSLEY: Piggybacking a little bit on what Mr. Horenstein testified to earlier, I believe that he had submitted a letter from Olson Engineering confirming that this, this site would not be appropriate for urban holding given the fact that it could readily be served. And, you know, representing I guess one of the largest chunks in this area, again we've talked with Hazel Dell Sewer District, also the City of Vancouver by, and several of the other service providers, and this site could essentially be readily served right away through pump stations and so forth.

Just one, one last thing I'd like to, to talk about, and I haven't had a great big chance to, to look at the, the new map this morning, but from appearances sake it looks like not only have there been a large portion of the Battle Ground urban growth boundary been retracted via the

Meadow Glade request, but it looks like there's several hundred acres if I'm not mistaken, probably more than 500, that have been taken out on both the west side of I-5 there kind of I think it's about 139th or so also on the west side up by the Fairgrounds and then to the, the east side of 179th, and I'm not really sure what, how that impacts what, you know, your projected population targets would be, but I would suggest that some of the areas that I suggested including, the Germann property, the Renaissance request and the Webb request, would be appropriate areas. Based upon infrastructure and the ability to provide services to those properties be an area to look at placing some residential land back in.

PRIDEMORE: What does this net out at, Pat?

LEE: Actually it is about 3,000, it accommodates about 3,000 population less than the January 14th map. Relative to the targets that were established in terms of accommodating population growth the January 14 map was about 4,000 over that target.

PRIDEMORE: What does that really translate to into percent, growth percent?

LEE: Around 1.8, a little bit more.

PRIDEMORE: So you're pretty close to the 1.83 as we were before?

LEE: Yeah.

PRIDEMORE: What does that do with jobs?

LEE: Jobs really have not been affected because we didn't take out job producing land necessarily. We focused on trying to balance the population dynamics between intensification in some areas and taking it out in others, but we didn't really affect the jobs, jobs lands.

PRIDEMORE: Do you have any estimates on the impacts on capital facilities?

LEE: No. No, we haven't done a separate capital facilities analysis. Intuitively I don't know that we, we go beyond the order of magnitude that would trigger yet, you know, another lane or anything along the, the highway system, I think we'd be within what would be accommodated in at least what has been proposed as the capital facilities plan which does include some significant upgrades to 72nd and 119th.

HOWSLEY: Is there any questions?

MORRIS: No. I -- I still haven't identified the areas that have been taken out by the Fairgrounds.

HOWSLEY: Do you mind if I point at them or can Pat point at them?

MORRIS: Anybody can point to them, but I can't see them at that distance and we don't have small maps.

LEE: Would you want to put up the 179th map. Yeah, I think that shows up on the 179th map.

PRIDEMORE: Do we have -- I mean we got the one, the 119th map, are there others that reflect what you have up here?

LEE: No. The only new map we produced was the, the areas where we were intensifying.

HOWSLEY: It's around that, this area in here has been taken out.

LEE: Yeah, that's the Banbury Estates area.

MORRIS: And what else?

HOWSLEY: Basically this area in here and this area up here.

LEE: That's correct.

HOWSLEY: And on top of that you would have what was taken out of Meadow Glade and I also believe that Winchester Hills, you know, after the exciting discussion of last week looks like it's been taken out as well. So as you can kind of see that, that has a, most of that land is in fact low density residential.

PRIDEMORE: Can we get these smaller maps? I mean I guess I'd like to have maps like this. Is that something we can get in short order or is it another weekend?

LEE: We can probably turn it around in a day. We actually had to go to GIS to get the map made and get it back to us.

HOWSLEY: Okay.

MORRIS: I have some questions for Mr. Lowry, procedure and legal questions about a new map at this time. Mr. Lowry, I understand from Mary Keltz that you were the one who's insisted that we see this map today because in case there were to be an inclination on the Board's part to adopt this scenario that it would need to be at least in public review today. And because there have been so many maps I don't remember if there ever was a map of 179th area interchange that reflected the map we don't have but with those large acreages taken out. And if not, how do we comply in this with the requirements for significant public involvement which we have indeed done for four years now?

LOWRY: The GMA, Rich Lowry, GMA has a provision in it dealing with public

involvement that indicates that if major changes are made after the close of testimony, that testimony needs to be reopened unless those changes are among other things within the range of options that were provided for in the EIS. I mean there obviously is a discomfort with making not so much the deletions because you had significant public testimony about deleting those areas that were unlikely to densify, but those areas that are proposed for upzoning, however, and it was for that reason that I wanted this to be put on the table before, before public testimony was closed. The change from R1-6 to R1-5 may not be considered major, but the changes going from single to multi-family could well be considered significant.

MORRIS: I don't -- there was indeed significant public opposition to Banbury Estates, but I don't think it was against it being included so much as it was against it being called office business park or office campus, whatever it was. But nonetheless, I don't remember any significant requests to drop the rest of that area out of any of the maps. Am I misremembering?

LEE: No. I think, I do think we received testimony from residents of the Banbury Estates area saying they would like to be out as their preference. Certainly they were concerned about the adjacent zoning as well. But, no, again it was, it was primarily an exercise that we were attempting to do to, you know, to maintain the relative population in terms of taking out some of those areas and where in actuality there is a much lesser density of site-specific requests than if you go over to the 117th/119th area and intensify some of the uses there. All the changes are shown, are shown on the large map that we have displayed here.

MORRIS: So you think that if we were to adopt the new proposed, the newest version of the maps that we would be clearly compliant with the public participation requirements of GMA?

LOWRY: No. I think there, there would be some risk.

PRIDEMORE: But your comments were after the public testimony was closed --

LOWRY: Correct.

PRIDEMORE: -- the public testimony has not been closed.

LOWRY: No, that's correct.

MORRIS: How long do we have to keep it open?

LOWRY: The statute just says that you have to reopen if you make substantial changes after closure.

MORRIS: Okay. Of course if we drag this out, then we could.

STANTON: Well, "if you make substantial changes" you're talking about the zoning or the

upzoning that we're talking about; right?

LOWRY: Uh-huh.

STANTON: I mean certainly we've been informed with the capital, some of the capital facilities information which may cause some changes. You're saying that we --

LOWRY: Yes. No, but the real test I think is whether you're staying within the alternatives that were analyzed in the EIS.

MORRIS: And I guess that was my question, were any of the alternatives, did any of the alternatives exclude the area around the Fairgrounds that's being excluded now?

LEE: Yes, Alternative 3 showed no expansion of the urban growth boundary.

MORRIS: Okay, thank you. Thank you. Next we have Jerry Winters.

WINTERS: Good morning. Jerry Winters, 6605 NE 74th Street. I'd like Map 11. 119th/117th.

LEE: That would be the 119th/117th.

DUST: As proposed or as originally?

WINTERS: Well, I'm going to hand you another one here.

LEE: Give the larger one --

MORRIS: We have another one.

LEE: -- because his parcel is in that industrial reserve area next to Lagler Farm.

WINTERS: I gave testimony last week and was talking about reasons why I would like to bring my parcel in and I talked about a neighboring parcel. I talked about the reasons, the advantages for the County, the advantages for myself. And now that Evan has it up there I've got another version with a few changes on it and I think might be helpful and I'll ask him to put it on the screen. I submitted a letter and a packet last week so I've come with not much information today, but I've come with, I've come with my the representative of the neighboring property, the Blair property, and where this little arrow says the "DIFFERENCE" the arrow is pointing right directly at the 20 acres that belong to me, the Winters property, and when it takes a 90-degree turn, that's the Blair property.

And I knew it was listed through a real estate and it was kind of late for me to make contact with them and I thought helpful I did make contact and I brought Nancy Blair today and she

would like to address the Commissioners on some separate concerns from my letter and I think she has some packets to hand out and I'm going to kind of turn the floor over to her. And I support her and I believe she supports me and so we came together today.

BLAIR: Good afternoon. I'm Nancy Blair and due to my father's medical problems and his age he has asked that I represent him today. He is 88 years old, he suffers from dementia, prostate cancer and congestive heart failure. My mother -- I'm sorry.

MORRIS: Would you like someone else to read your letter?

BLAIR: No, I can do it.

MORRIS: Are you sure?

BLAIR: I'll do it. I'll do fine. I just get emotional at times. My mother was the primary caregiver but passed away November 2003. My father's having a very difficult time dealing with her death. He seems, you know, more confused and not able to take care of most of his needs. I told him it's time to move because I'm very concerned about his safety. His pension, his Social Security benefits, will not cover retirement home costs, he will have to sell his property. My parents did ask the Commission in 1999 and 2000 to consider rezoning their property, they sent letters and I've included those letters in the packet, so they've been wanting to do this for a number of years. Thank you. I'm sorry, sometimes I tend to get a little emotional when I talk about my parents, but I appreciate you allowing me to speak for my father and I'd like you to meet John Morris, he's from Coldwell Banker.

MR. MORRIS: Thank you. John Morris, Coldwell Banker, 12000 SE Mill Plain Boulevard. I think Nancy you can tell by the emotions is trying very hard to take care of the situation for her parents. The letters that you've got show that back in 1999 and in 2000 her mother had made an attempt to have some consideration made to have their property rezoned. This is a property that was a family lifelong property. The house was built by her mother's grandfather. Her father who was born here in Sifton was born in his grandmother's house and delivered by his grandmother, these folks have been lifelong county residents and contributors to the county. The process last year by which you were hearing these individual lot requests was a time frame when her mother became ill and passed away so they missed the opportunity to get this request in front of the Commissioners at that time.

The property is borders on 119th Street, it's served by that street, and it's immediately adjacent to the properties that you've considered expanding the boundaries out to. The development of this property is inevitable, it eventually will happen, our request is that you give some consideration to sooner rather than later in that her father is needing the care and needing the income from the sale of the property so that he can live out his final years with dignity. I know you've given a lot of consideration to the properties in the immediate vicinity, in Bowyer's and other properties, we feel that this would give perhaps an opportunity for some additional light industrial for some jobs and support to the residential areas that you have

designated in that vicinity.

STANTON: Jerry, it looks like you're asking for that whole bump there which would take in some properties that I don't see represented, the ones that are still gray. Do you--

WINTERS: Yeah, they're urban 20 holding.

STANTON: Is it their desire to come inside the boundary as well? Have we heard anything from any of those do you know, Pat?

LEE: No. No, I have not heard from those. Actually the original request by the Blairs was to go from Ag-20 to R-5 which was one of those rural. So it's still the same process believe it or not, but now as I understand it if you're consistent with what Jerry requested last week, you're looking at a potential industrial designation in that area.

MR. MORRIS: They would be satisfied with any type of a redesignation that would put their property into a marketable situation. We feel very strongly that we could find a buyer for their property as a light industrial if that's the most appropriate redesignation for that property. Residential use, obviously there's a number of buyers for that, but it certainly looks to me like the light industrial use would probably be more reasonable for that site.

PRIDEMORE: How large is just the Blair parcel?

MR. MORRIS: The Blair parcel is 19.56 roughly, around 20 acres.

MORRIS: Other questions? Thank you.

MR. MORRIS: Thank you very much.

WINTERS: Thank you.

BLAIR: Thanks.

MORRIS: Let's see, Nancy Blair you joined him and Chester Knapp, I'm sorry, please.

KNAPP: I promise to be brief. I'm Chester Knapp, 1788 57th Street, Washougal, Washington 98671. Last week I had put a letter and request of inclusion in the urban growth boundary for a parcel that my wife and I own. It's 4.8 acres immediately adjacent to the existing urban growth boundary which is proposed for 7500-square foot lots. The reason for that is is immediately on our southwest corner Washougal has a large Pacific Lifestyle subdivision that's actually being framed as we speak, there are no available lots left. So we've got urban services right there. My neighbors to the west we actually own, our property is 200 feet wide approximately and 1,000 feet long, on our 1,000 foot boundary we have a 30-foot road easement that goes all the way up and serves the other properties. And the reason why I

came last week on such a rush was we were informed by our neighbors not to plant a tree because they're planning on taking the road up through there utilizing that and it's 7500-square foot lots.

So our request quite simply was if on one side of the street there's going to be 7500-square foot lots would you please consider including us into that same boundary so that we could have similar properties on both sides. We are currently zoned for 5-acre minimum which-- anyways that's, that was the crux of my request last week was to please be considered for inclusion on that boundary line if possible.

MORRIS: Evan, can you point to the parcel again.

KNAPP: Oh, absolutely.

DUST: I'm trying to do it by memory.

KNAPP: No, that's fine.

DUST: Are we in here?

MORRIS: Thank you.

KNAPP: I'm terribly sorry, yes, sir. Actually, gosh, it's this parcel, this parcel and this parcel, there's all (inaudible), all three of those parcels there are our parcel.

MORRIS: And you wanted to plant a tree and someone --

KNAPP: Well, I actually --

MORRIS: You can plant a tree.

KNAPP: Well, it's in an easement area that they're planning on running the road through and so they were trying to save me some grief, which was very nice, but then anyways, so with that discussion in mind it was like, well, they've already made arrangements with a developer to sell their property and, you know, logic dictated, well, maybe I should try to see if at least we could be similar to the product across the street. So it would be an inclusion of 4.8 acres. The yellow immediately below 57th Street has all been developed into Pacific Lifestyle Homes, they're currently framing up the last bunch of houses now so. But anyways, there's sewer and water and everything on the southwest corner so it would be consistent with what's taking place in the area.

MORRIS: Questions? Thank you.

KNAPP: Oh, well, there's one other thing, I'm sorry, and I didn't put it on there, I'm going to

be the only person probably in the world that's going to argue for inclusion of the Meadow Glade area, but I just found out this morning it's going out. I personally believe that there are some sewer issues there that really ought to be fixed so, you know, Battle Ground ought to, ought to deal with it so I will argue for the inclusion of Meadow Glade. Thank you so much and have a great day.

MORRIS: Thank you. He's a brave man because you were on TV.

KNAPP: Yes, I know.

MORRIS: Greg Kurahashi. Do you all think there's anything left to say about the Lear property?

PRIDEMORE: He's not going to let us forget it, is he?

MORRIS: No, he's not.

KURAHASHI: I guess he's not, he asked me to speak in front of you today. My name is Gregory Kurahashi, I own a company called Kurahashi & Associates, my address is 15580 SW Jay Street in Beaverton, Oregon. I'm a civil engineer planner that represents Joe regarding the site and I've brought a few more pieces of information that are probably pretty important to the development of the property and I'd like to share that with you. Joe has asked me to share some of the issues that you may not be aware of.

First of all, Joe does own all the parcels that are shown on, in red on the right side of the highway and has control of those pieces, so they're all within one ownership and can be consolidated to make one parcel. So they're not individual parcels that would be developed as commercial, they would be -- they could be developed as one complete parcel.

MORRIS: They're in red did you say?

KURAHASHI: That is correct.

LEE: And that is Battle Ground's.

STANTON: On the Battle Ground map.

KURAHASHI: I'm sorry?

MORRIS: I'm looking at it and --

KURAHASHI: The 6 acres that Joe owns.

PRIDEMORE: Joe, why don't you put that map up.

MORRIS: Oh, it's, oh, okay, I see, thank you.

KURAHASHI: Yes. It was you looked at it this morning a little bit more.

MORRIS: Yes. Thank you.

KURAHASHI: Yes. Okay. And also that Mr. Moon's property is across the street from that piece at the corner of the lots that are shown on the map there which are an extension of 120th I believe, and the street that goes into the large lot subdivision shown on the map, he's on the northeast corner of that intersection. Northwest corner of that intersection.

The other things that I'd like to mention is the general area does not have a commercial site within, located within about a half a mile of it and one of the things that's important is that if you're looking to try to have people walk to their commercial services, that a neighborhood commercial or something of that nature should be located close enough that they can actually walk to it. In other areas of your county you've made a definite attempt to do that and put a commercial area close enough to make walking and not crossing a major highway actually happen and in this case that would be nice if that was the case in this, in this area, the -- especially since at this point in time there are residential areas around it that would have to go more than that distance to, to get to a commercial area.

Also there was a comment made earlier through Mr. Moon that there is -- his letter to you that sewer services may not, may not be available, there is a STEP system available to that site. STEP systems are a special system in which the septic tank wastes are held in a tank and the water from that tank is pumped into the sewer system so there's no major solids that get into the line. Because of that you can have a lot of capacity and small line. The line itself is available for service to this area. There are some technical issues regarding putting a commercial site on a STEP system, but that is basically an oil issue of greases and oils being captured before they get into the system and that can be readily handled. So technically sewers are available and would be available to serve a commercial site. Water systems are also available in terms of a line in the streets and can be enlarged by this developer, by the developer who would buy the property. And probably the main thing that I would like to -- and if there was a need for future extensions for sewer lines into the area for gravity feed systems if it was thought by the County and Hazel Dell Sewer District that that would be better a (inaudible) agreement could be written by the owner of this or the buyer of this property or the owner of this property to have those lines be partially paid for by the persons who own the property and that way actually supporting future gravity service to the area if it was necessary.

The final thing that I would mention is we see a real need for Mr. Lear's property to participate in intersection improvements from the standpoint of dedicating right-of-way. There will be a need we believe for this area to have more traffic turning movements available in the intersection and his parcel and the commercial parcel across the street south of 179th

are critical to this because they control the needed dedication for the street to be widened to have left-turn movements and right-turn movements be implemented because they line up in a way that would benefit a longer street which is critical on the east side. So we feel that that dedication that -- we're willing to provide that dedication not only for the streets needs that are to serve the industrial area and the residential area on our side, but also any future extensions that the County may need for a major street connectivity in the area, and by doing that I think that we could improve the quality of the SR-503 intersection and whatever the County and the City needs in the future. Joe, did you want to add anything?

LEAR: Well, I do have a copy of the letter that Austin and Lee Moon sent to the Commissioners last week and they did make some major errors, I'm sure it was an honest mistake, but they claim that they -- there was only 100 hookups for the Meadow Glade sewer STEP system, I have talked to the engineers there at Hazel Dell Sewer and said there is a minimum of 1,000 hookups, so they probably just didn't type that extra zero in there. I hope that's the case.

This same piece of property that we are requesting to be commercial I had placed in there as a site-specific for commercial over four years ago. I'm not sure whether it ever came before the Commissioners for that. I am -- my wife and I are the one that's developed this whole Windsong Acres development. It was intended to be originally a private gated community. We presented that to Mr. and Mrs. Moon to participate, we came before the Board to make it a private gated community and it was approved subject to all of the property owners along 172nd Circle to participate. The Moons agreed in verbal, and I still old-fashioned, I trust a man's words, they said they would participate and then when it came to signing the road maintenance agreement they says, no, we have a private road now, we don't have to pay for anything, so that completely destroyed the gated community because everyone along that road according to County requirements must participate. So that development is dead. And of course my expenses keep going on, almost 2,000 a month in interest payments, so I'm quite a ways in debt at this point. And that's all I have to say. Thank you very much.

KURAHASHI: Thank you.

MORRIS: Questions?

PRIDEMORE: Yeah. If I understood Mr. I think it was Mr. Horenstein's testimony this morning regarding this site, there's a commercial user who's interested or willing to put in a sewer line or to bring sewer to this. Is that --

LEAR: The sewer is in the line. I'm sorry, the sewer is there.

KURAHASHI: There's an --

PRIDEMORE: That's the STEP system I guess. I wish he was still here because I could have got some clarification.

KURAHASHI: Oh, I'm sorry, there was a STEP system already installed to serve this area when Windsong Acres was developed and the line is basically a three-inch line that goes northerly --

PRIDEMORE: Right. No, I'm familiar with the system that's there. I guess when he was speaking this morning I thought he was talking about somebody who was willing to make the capital investment in the sewer line.

KURAHASHI: Well, I believe he was saying that the -- that with the development of areas with more density in this area that participation by larger, by larger pieces of a property being at the end of the line generates the ability for lines to get there because they'll pay for those lines coming to that location and find a way to get it there if they need gravity service in a way that would be economically feasible. And that's probably what is happening here, it was by generating a large industrial piece and some commercial pieces at the end of the line, either you will receive a lot of (inaudible) agreements to allow the line to get to them or construction as part of the line through to get to it.

MORRIS: Thank you.

LEAR: Yeah, we are still requesting the yellow part to be residential R1-5 or R1-6 according to what Battle Ground wants and the along -- the part along the highway to be commercial.

STANTON: And I guess the only question that I have remaining is that I understood that the STEP system had a certain number of hookups that were available and when you looked at the zoning in the rural center that if all of it developed the way it was scheduled to develop, all of the hookups would be used. If you're talking about using the same sewer system what you do is take part of that capacity and preclude some of the other development if I understand the way the system is set up. And then would that put -- I mean then what? Basically there's a moratorium until there's a new sewer system I guess.

KURAHASHI: The STEP system, one of the reasons it's used so often in hilly areas and areas that have hard, a hard time to get gravity feed systems is they're inexpensive because the line itself is a three-inch pressure line that can be installed in a small portion of a right-of-way or to get there. So basically if there was a need for additional capacity and there wasn't any available at any given time, a new line could be parallel the existing line and a whole doubling the capacity could be built into the system. So that's what would happen if that could be allowed was to increase the line size and make a pressure line that could hold the capacity.

STANTON: Because there is the potential for quite a bit of additional capacity because if I remember correctly, that red square that's right above Mr. Lear's property is the part that Battle Ground has referred to as a regional commercial center.

KURAHASHI: That's correct. So it would have to have quite a bit of more capacity developed to get there so they would have to put a system to increase the capacity at that point. Mr. Lear's property is served by a line that comes down from the top of that red square that's on the map on the north side paralleling the SR-503 on the east side and then crossing at the 179th intersection to serve his property and the properties that he developed as single-family residential, and so that line was installed as part of a line I believe by the, by the State for him. But as far as either parallel line or putting a bigger line in, it can, it can be put in there as a pressure line served by a STEP system. The advantage to a STEP system is there is no pump station that the City or the County, the City would have to maintain, it is maintained as individual pumps on each house attached to a, a septic tank and it pumps sewage from each house into the line and that line then carries to and goes to the main gravity feed system that's north of the site in the city of Battle Ground. So that's how it's built.

LEAR: One other thing --

MORRIS: Wait, let me, I need to clarify something because this is getting very --

STANTON: I'm getting really confused.

MORRIS: Okay. Is the line that you just described that runs down Mr. Lear's property adjacent to 117th or 112th, whatever it's called there, is that gravity or STEP line?

KURAHASHI: It's a STEP system line.

STANTON: Which is part of --

MORRIS: Part of the whole --

STANTON: -- the Meadow Glade --

MORRIS: -- the entire Meadow Glade STEP system.

STANTON: -- sewer district. So when this area gets annexed to the city of Battle Ground are you talking about a different destination for the sewage --

KURAHASHI: No.

STANTON: -- being into Battle Ground?

KURAHASHI: No, it would still go through the same gravity system that's available when the -- in the Battle Ground system. When it hits the end of the line where it goes into the gravity system north of the property, there's still a pressure line that everybody has to get into, that's correct.

MORRIS: Okay. Mr. Howsley, you had your hand up, did you want to clarify anything about what Mr. Horenstein had said? Because I thought I heard the same thing that Mr. Pridemore did, that I thought they were talking gravity line there.

HOWSLEY: Yeah, for the record James Howsley. It's my understanding that the developer would extend basically any kind of gravity line from the city of Battle Ground down to the site to serve it.

MORRIS: That's what I thought.

KURAHASHI: Then I'm sorry because I didn't understand that that was what was proposed.

PRIDEMORE: So there is a user who's already --

MORRIS: That would be helpful to have that firmed up.

HOWSLEY: Yes. And I could probably get him to send something to you through --

MORRIS: Firm up, okay. Thanks.

HOWSLEY: Thank you.

KURAHASHI: Sorry. So there is gravity service available in a direction that he can go to get to gravity line and owns the right-of-way to that point?

MORRIS: I don't know, we'll have to wait until we hear, but our assumption is when developers say things like that, it means whatever it takes they'll get it there.

KURAHASHI: Okay. Well, he can get it there then I guess.

LEAR: There, there is one thing that has not been brought up before. The line that goes under SR-503 to my property goes through an 18-inch culvert so there's plenty of room to add more lines through that culvert under SR-503.

MORRIS: I don't think I'd offer up too much more information if I were you, Mr. Lear, we're gluttoned with this one right now.

LEAR: Thank you.

KURAHASHI: Okay, appreciate it.

MORRIS: Thank you. Steve Stuart.

PRIDEMORE: Madam Chair, what's the plans we're --

MORRIS: Well, this is the end of our sign-up so I'm assuming that once Mr. Stuart finishes we will end this morning's session, we'll resume at 1:00 or 1:30, maybe a little bit late, we'll take a full hour at least for lunch.

LEE: I think it's your call, I don't think we specifically --

PRIDEMORE: I think we did. It seems like it was 1:00.

LEE: Is it 1:00? 1:00 to 5:00 perhaps.

MORRIS: And there may or may not be anyone here this afternoon. Oh, good, it's not new.

STUART: We're still on maps.

PRIDEMORE: We still hadn't heard from the Chamber. I guess I thought they were --

STANTON: I know it, I was thinking the same thing. We did in a letter.

PRIDEMORE: Yeah, many letters, in newsletters.

STUART: But last week actually I thought I heard John McKibbin say that he would be coming back in today.

MORRIS: He may come this afternoon, we'll see.

STUART: Okay. Well, thank you again for the chance to testify. For the record my name is Steve Stuart and at 300 West 23rd Street in Vancouver and I am the executive director of Friends of Clark County representing 400, roughly 400 members countywide. First of all I wanted to thank the Commissioners and planning staff and everybody else who has been involved in this long drawn out process that we hopefully are finally coming to a close on. What I wanted to do is kind of very similar to what Mr. Horenstein and Mr. Printz did earlier is focus on some generalities and then go into a little bit of site-specific.

When we were looking at the maps, and you've heard this before from me, is that we had five overarching principles; job growth over residential growth; support for and enhancement of environmentally sensitive areas; planning for growth where the infrastructure is already in place; integrating growth maps with transportation corridors, the focus public investment areas and other pieces of the puzzle that are already in place, and that's actually what my, my props are, are here for is that the underlying form is the natural resources map. It's a little bit of an older version of it, but it maintains to today roughly in shape. I also have the transportation system, the regional transportation system map, map of the focus public investment areas and a map of the school districts and the idea is then to look at all of these maps throughout these, you know, past two years is --

LEE: Steve, do you want to slow down a little bit.

STUART: Oh, I'm sorry -- is to look through, look through these maps and try to integrate that planning process to make sure that whatever we come up with is supportable on a variety of different levels. The first generality I wanted to just touch on is the capital facilities costs. We understand the tough funding realities and Commissioner Morris has stated it very well that we're not alone as far as counties go in having capital funding shortfalls, but I think that drives home the need for creative planning so that we can maximize our leverage of existing infrastructure. Roads, we're facing billion dollar deficits. Battle Ground is still not in with their estimates of what it's going to cost. Obviously, you know, changing what Battle Ground gets in this newest map will change what their needs are, but nevertheless we expect they have, they will have extreme needs, and that schools, Battle Ground School District anticipating 18 new schools for \$440 million over the next 20 years, they just failed a \$50 million bond levy. And I say failed, it was still over 50 percent and not to get into the super majority issue, but nevertheless they, they still haven't gotten that 50 million to meet the ir existing need, let alone the \$440 million of need that they will anticipate over the next 20 years. So that's, that's all I really wanted to say about capital facilities, just to kind of touch on it.

The other kind of generality I wanted to touch on was ag land conversion. And it's been talked about before that we do have concerns that almost 2800 acres of agricultural land would be converted for urban uses and the quote I wanted to give you was something that has been in other literature and it's that only after a county's agricultural, forestry and mineral resource lands have been identified and actions taken to conserve them and its critical areas, including aquifers, are identified and protected, is it then possible and appropriate to determine where on the remaining land urban growth should be directed pursuant to RCW 36.70A. There are areas that are in urban reserve currently that are not agricultural land and when I'm looking at these site-specific maps I'll point that out. What I wanted to do with the individual 12 maps that we got last week was to just go through and say in these expansion areas here is an ag piece, here is an ag piece, and there are some of the agricultural pieces that are already in urban reserve and certainly there are some of the reserve pieces that are not included in the expansion. So if we were looking at expansion areas we would hope that we would look first at the reserve areas, then look to other areas outside of that, including, you know, the potential for ag conversion.

So the only other thing I wanted to talk about was the two things that both Mr. Horenstein and Mr. Printz talked about in general and that is urban holding and mixed use. Urban holding, good planning tool to phase in development making sure infrastructure is in place to support the construction. We actually still support phasing to assure the adequate land supply but avoid freezing growth, and that phasing, there is money out there, it's been stated before, we're not at a zero dollar point for jurisdictions, we're just at a point where we can't pay for everything. But we don't have to pay for everything right now but we should look to where are the low hanging fruit, where are the areas that these, you know, the developers and the

developers' attorneys and other landowners have come to us and said we're ready, you know, and we can provide some jobs land now and looked at those areas and open them up, don't put an urban holding classification on them. Then there are other areas that are going to be harder to service. Those areas, slap an urban holding classification on them until they're right. It's simply a matter of trying to pluck the low hanging fruit, leverage the dollars from the low hanging fruit to produce revenues that we can use elsewhere.

We actually agree with BIA that there should be specific tests associated with any urban holding language. As of right now it seems to be a fatal flaw in the document, in the actual language itself, is that there are no specific tests to determine when you have full services, when you will be able to get out of urban holding. Those kinds of tests are going to be necessary so the jurisdictions, the residents and the building community, have the certainty that we all desire. And just speaking to Vancouver, we actually agree again that annexation isn't likely in some areas so, so long as there is an or in the language to say annexation or provision of urban services, then we don't think that that should be a problem to include some urban holding language on areas of Vancouver that are not ripe yet. If you had it be that the same as the language for other jurisdictions that you had an "and," that you had to have annexation and the provision of urban services, then I think it would be a problem, but if you have the "or" it shouldn't be a problem. As far as the other jurisdictions, again it's just given the proximity to existing incorporated areas it makes sense to include annexation as a requirement for the smaller cities. It's, as Mr. Howsley mentioned just a little bit ago that for some of the smaller jurisdictions that are providing the services to the expansion areas it makes sense to include annexation as a requirement.

The second one was mixed use. We do have concerns with where they're placed on the maps. Again it's been stated before that, you know, we're looking along existing infrastructure, specifically looking along major arterials as to where mixed use really can be the highest and best use. Once you start getting away from those major arterials or where you're expecting there to be a major arterial, you start facing some real issues with whether the -- whether it just makes sense for the market, whether you can actually support a small commercial area, a small commercial node with residential attached, high density residential attached once you get outside of the major arterials. Like the BIA we actually do like the idea of proposing floating zones. There was a Maryland example that was given to you by the Building Industry Association and it's actually an excellent example. We have some concerns with the size of the acreage that's proposed by Maryland and also some of the floor to area ratios that they are -- that they look at in Maryland versus what you've looked at. We love the idea of having a work group look at mixed use, and Mr. Printz and myself did put together something for the City of Camas and that's in the process right now, it would be great to get a work group, including staff, together to talk about, you know, how we could craft a mixed use ordinance that would get used. And obviously that's what we all want is something that will not just be sitting in a -- on a shelf somewhere but will actually get used. So with that, I don't know if you wanted to ask me questions about that piece of it or just to go straight into the maps.

MORRIS: I want to see what you think we ought to put in an (inaudible) take out anything that was ag.

STUART: You bet. You bet.

MORRIS: Maps.

STUART: When I look at the individual maps absolutely, that's something I did look at was not just saying, well, let's take out and not add somewhere else, absolutely.

STANTON: But can I just clarify on the language that you were talking about for the Vancouver urban growth boundary area and urban holding. You said include or provision for urban services and when you said "urban services" it caused me to think about, you're talking more than just the capital facilities?

STUART: No. I'm talking about in the existing language there are, you know, there are several criteria that you must meet and in Vancouver there was an "or," you know, that you must be annexed or you must have this other, this other piece. And I forget what the exact language was, whether it was infrastructure or urban services or what, what language they specifically used and, but that's all I was speaking of.

STANTON: I'll have to look back at that too.

STUART: I actually wasn't proposing any sort of expansion of that language, I was simply saying that the "or" itself, just that one word.

PRIDEMORE: Both you and Mr. Printz mentioned the Camas ordinance on the mixed use stuff so that's something that you think will be effective as the Camas model or is it something that -- I'm trying to get a sense of how much work is will this task force or whatever.

STUART: Right. You know, it's amazing how similar the, you know, the, how similar we were so that Mr. Printz and myself in coming together on what were the principles, what were the principles of mixed use based on the area, based on suburban versus urban environments, vertical versus horizontal, a lot of these different aspects of mixed use and there are only four or five main pieces. On the vast majority I think you'll find quick agreement, the devil's in the detail and it will simply be a matter of, you know, how do we create the flexibility. I don't anticipate that it would take, you know, a, you know, a six-month process or something to come to it. I mean, you know, I think Mr. Printz and myself, you know, worked over the course of maybe eight hours together on this to come up with something, will this work in Camas, it still needs some revision, you know, some revisions made to it for it to actually be effective. There have been other folks that are now getting involved in the process that are, that are starting to help with that, we simply set up a template for it. I don't think that it would, I don't think it would necessarily as a, as time intensive as you might think.

PRIDEMORE: We always go into those task forces thinking that and I think our average time is a year and a half or something, which is not going to help us very much for this update.

STUART: Well, and that's, that's all about setting a time limit. And I mean if we set, if we set the expectation that you are going to be done come hell or high water after a month, then, you know, then the task force knows, well, we better get to business otherwise it's worthless. So I think that you can set those expectations if you choose.

All right. So the first map is looking -- I figured I'd go from north to, from north to south and then kind of from west to east down from there. The first map, and forgive the writing on the sides of these, I was actually hoping to use clean ones but I'll -- but mine actually work fine, the outlined areas on all of these maps that the blue outline that I put on them was the agricultural designations, so any land that was actually agri, that designated for ag. This area is just designated for an industrial reserve overlay I believe. The southeast corner of this was suggested by Mr. Horenstein as a possible industrial land bank, we're actually in strong support of that. One thing it -- when that legislation went through in, in, I forget, two years ago, when that went through One Thousand Friends of Washington who I was with at the time were in support of the legislation and actually helped craft it and I believe it's a, it is good tight legislation to allow for industrial uses in an area that is noncontiguous to an urban growth area. This is a perfect situation for that. You have quite a distance between La Center the city and La Center Junction and to be able to, to activate the jobs land at that junction would be I think a great benefit to not only La Center but to the County as well and there are tax revenue sharing provisions within the industrial land banks legislation.

So, you know, the work that you had spoken of that maybe we could start ripening revenue sharing between jurisdictions, the thought when industrial land banks legislation was going through was that this would help that process, that you would start seeing a positive way to do revenue sharing and a positive, an actual example of it, and so that jurisdictions would see, oh, we're not just going to get left out in the cold. These are large parcels, these are -- it's an area right along existing infrastructure, underused existing infrastructure, the exact kind of thing that was envisioned when the industrial land banks bill was passed by the Legislature. And the other piece that is important on this as far as timing goes is something that Mr. Horenstein mentioned that I had forgotten, which is it's use it or lose it, that if we don't use this legislation, if we don't use these provisions by 2007, they go away. And so to be able to designate an industrial land bank now in an area where we're already -- because of the Cowlitz Tribe's proposal for the area we're already now anticipating some growth for that area, some sort of job producing growth. And on the long-term map this is also part of a focus public investment area. We think this is a great opportunity to, to grab onto some low hanging fruit and this is, this is in our opinion some great low hanging fruit, so we would like to see that included as an industrial land bank.

PRIDEMORE: Before you go on--

STUART: Oh, go ahead.

STANTON: Oh, go ahead. I was just remembering, and I could be wrong, that we had to show a shortage of other industrial land in order to establish a land bank.

STUART: Of the same type, yes. You, basically you have to do an inventory analysis of the neighboring jurisdictions and through those neighboring jurisdictions you have to show that within urban growth boundaries you do not have like type land available. My belief on this would be that because of the type of land that we're talking about and because of the type of development opportunity we're talking about, that, that we would be able to satisfy that provision.

STANTON: Go ahead.

PRIDEMORE: And you would support designating this as a rural lands bank on a spec basis? I mean that we don't know what the development may or may not be, we should just designate it anyway?

STUART: I'll have to -- I'm having a vague recollection that there is a provision within the Legislation --

PRIDEMORE: There's two different kinds that we can do.

STUART: Right, there are two different kinds of land banks.

PRIDEMORE: One is on spec, we can't do it on spec. I've kind of taken the position that I don't want to do that unless we know who the developer is and can establish the fact that there isn't suitable lands already elsewhere.

STUART: While I would certainly like to see a development proposal already in place for the area given that Mr. Horenstein has been advocating for that, for that for some time for this area to be brought in, my understanding that it is that there are development opportunities that would happen in relatively short order, that, yes, it is speculation but that it is speculation on, based on good information.

PRIDEMORE: And then also you characterize this as having adequate public facilities, capital facilities, already in place and yet it doesn't have sewer and it doesn't have -- the interchange there is a very tight overpass.

STUART: Well, absolutely. And as far as, I think I was, I was speaking more to I-5 northbound in that we had the underused capacity that's been spoken of in the Discovery Corridor concept. Regarding water and sewer, you're absolutely right, there are very strict regulations in the industrial land banks, you know, Legislation that actually says that you can extend services to an industrial land bank but only, but only for the industrial land bank, that

you may not have hookups anywhere along the line -- that you may not have hookups anywhere along the line to or through the rural areas connecting them. I guess I look at this as what are we going to do long-term at that junction, you know, what is, what is going to happen long-term at that junction and how can we lock that in place if we want jobs producing land there. If we think that that's where jobs are going to go long-term, why shouldn't we lock them in and the only other way to do it is to extend La Center all the way along Timmen's Road, all the way from where they are now across a wetland, across, you know, a long expanse of rural area to the Junction which I think is a less appealing option certainly for myself.

PRIDEMORE: Well, that's their stated objective longer term. So and then also on the designation of this land, it seems that there is land very like this at Ridgefield Junction where we could get a bigger bang out of the infrastructure investment that's already going to be made and required there. It also this land would then be in competition with several industrial sites where people have made significant investments in upgrading land making it shovel ready and now we're going to come in and designate more land that they're going to have to compete with.

STUART: Well, and if that were the outcome of an analysis, there would be an analysis that would have to be done on whether like types of land were available and if that was the outcome of the analysis, and I certainly don't, I don't claim to know better than you as far as what land is available around there, if that is the outcome, then they wouldn't, then it would be not allowed, then the industrial land bank would not be allowed there, but at least by starting the process you'd find out.

PRIDEMORE: We do have the opportunity to do two of these land banks and I'm not opposed to doing them. I keep thinking if we on spec we decided this is, this location and maybe we do another one and then a major industrial employer comes in who wants to locate someplace else and we don't have the tool anymore that's --

STUART: Certainly keeping one in your pocket, at least one in your pocket wouldn't be a bad idea.

PRIDEMORE: Thank you.

STUART: And actually the next map is Ridgefield so we can talk a little bit about the Ridgefield piece. So looking at Ridgefield, quite a bit of the proposed expansion area is agricultural land. The two areas on the northern boundary of Ridgefield are also part of the focus public investment area and because of their proximity to Interstate 5, also because of their proximity to other, to other job creation entities in Ridgefield, those may be areas that you, that you decide you want to bring in anyway and those are not areas that we would, we could either take them or leave them as far as those two areas go, quite frankly. The area we're most concerned with is on the northeast side of Ridgefield, and that's the Boschma properties, and what you're looking at there are some high value agricultural lands away from

Interstate 5 in a truly rural area and to intensify uses in the way that's proposed would be incredibly detrimental not only to the rural nature of the community but to the agricultural nature of the community. And we have limited high value ag land left and to be able to be bringing in those, all of those parcels, we think is just not justified, especially when there are other areas that you could bring in. And I will definitely, Commissioner Morris, I will absolutely be pointing out those areas as we go through the, go through the maps because that was one of the things that I had looked at was, well, okay, if we're going to take this land out, and this is job producing land that we're talking about, where are we going to put that. So that's something that we were concerned about.

MORRIS: Just as another factor in this discussion, Steve, as you're speaking, do you -- as you go along and you make suggestions about areas that come out because they're ag could you note whether or not they are being used for ag. Because immediately to the east of there then is the Walker property and clearly that Mr. Walker is trying to farm it and he'd like not to so.

STUART: Well, and that's -- and you had spoken about that before --

MORRIS: Right.

STUART: -- I mean it's, it's part of it is it in use and part of it is like you said there are people saying, well, I'm using but I want to get out. And you had had the discussion with I think it was Vance Corum last week about, well, how do we keep these people in farming. You can't just zone their land for ag and then just expect them to keep going, it's just not fair. And so, you know, we need to be looking at ways, you know, how can we make markets. You know, one of the things, two pieces of legislation that I had drafted when I was in Olympia, one of them was to create a purchase of agricultural conservation easements programs statewide which now exists. There also was --

MORRIS: Is there any money in it?

STUART: No, that was the problem. Everybody's willing to put in --

MORRIS: Nice work.

STUART: Yeah, I know exactly. It's like here, I'll put this new empty cup out there, yeah, for people to throw a dime in. But and the other thing that we did was actually, was actually encourage State institutions to purchase in-state agricultural products. And that has worked, we've seen an increase of almost 40 percent in State institutional purchasing of in-state agriculture. Now simply, you know, you go to the cafeteria to State, you know, at a State building you want to be able to see in-state apples and you don't want to see New Zealand apples. So anyway, as far as the agricultural land goes, point taken and I will absolutely look into either on the land I know of that's already being farmed and let you know and on the lands I don't, looking into that.

MORRIS: Thanks.

STUART: Sure. Battle Ground. So Battle Ground is a brave new world today compared to what this map indicates so.

MORRIS: Did you look at all of the latest Battle Ground maps?

STUART: I did. I did. I went back and forth with various, three or four different maps and looked at Battle Ground. The only area that I'll really touch on because the rest of it I actually am, you know, after looking at it I think we're okay with the rest of it. We have some members who have concerns about the area on the north edge of Battle Ground, the blue parcel on the, yeah, on the west side of SR-503, the headwaters to Manly Creek are located on that parcel, we have some underground springs that potentially could be issues. What we would like to see, we understand the constraints, we understand that there are -- that it's a big flat parcel and that Battle Ground has been looking for big flat parcels to put jobs on, we support that so it's a tough, it's a tough spot for us to be in. What we would hope is that there was some way to limit the damage to any springs or any sort of salmon bearing stream. Obviously we have ESA and other tools to use for that. The hope would be that we -- that something could be master planned to very much limit the impact.

But the only area other than that that I really wanted to touch on was on the west side of Battle Ground. There the outlined area is designated as agricultural land and that area is still in, it is still included in the expansion area of Battle Ground as of today's map. Those are areas that as you get away from SR-502, those are areas that are increasingly rural and increasingly are still being used for small scale ag and for it ends up being a lot of rural residential uses but small scale ag on those properties as well that have kept them in a very rural state. We're concerned that as you phase into the rural area that we're, we are not creating the buffers between rural and urban that produce better, better neighborhoods and communities.

The other piece of Battle Ground in that same area is you can see there's R-22 designation directly along SR-502, yet as you go north away from SR-502 you get into a mixed use node. And this is kind of what I was speaking about just a little while ago with mixed use is that some of the colors on the map I think could be adjusted a little bit in that you have rural, you have people living in residential directly along a major arterial, which again if I'm buying a house I don't necessarily want to be on the main drag, especially one that's going to see the increase in size, in capacity, and in traffic that 502 is slated for. So to be able to put more business frontage on the main drag and to be able to keep the residential kind of away from the main drag is something that we just think makes from a planning perspective makes sense.

The other piece of it is is that if you're looking for light industrial or jobs type land, instead of mixed use along that main drag it seems that it would be perfectly appropriate to take at least, you know, several of those larger parcels, buffer them with treescape along the main drag of 502 but to create light industrial on that drag. The City of Battle Ground in their 50-year

vision has talked about as they move toward Dollars Corner having a boulevard effect for 502 and having a tree buffer, a treelined buffer on 502, but behind that buffer having office campus and having light industrial and those kinds of things, some of their job centers on that west side so that the traffic for those business don't have to go through, all the way through Battle Ground, they can go directly from the 219th Interchange to the site and out without interrupting a lot of the main street traffic. So that's something that, you know, is an area that could be changed to provide more light industrial or office business campus, office park business campus. If there aren't any questions about Battle Ground, I'll just move on.

MORRIS: Did you talk -- well, no. I though had the same thought you have just verbalized but I was wondering if Battle Ground ever had discussed that possibility?

STUART: Regarding which piece?

MORRIS: More industrial uses with tree buffering along 219th Street. I've been hesitant to really interfere very much with the way the Cities want to zone --

STUART: Absolutely.

MORRIS: -- but I just wondered if you had any?

STUART: They did. As they're moving toward, as they move towards Dollars Corner, yes, they had in their 50-year vision they did have that. In the most recent maps I've seen from them, the closer in areas they are, they were looking at residential right along, right along 219th there and I don't know why, quite frankly.

MORRIS: But then if they did move to the west with industrial, they would have pockets of residential which at least would break it up I suppose.

STUART: Yes.

PRIDEMORE: The other side to it, Steve, is if it was designated as you talk about and putting more mixed use down there, the likelihood of the commercial mixed use being developed right along the freeway or the State Route is very high and you end up with more of a commercial strip feel than you already have.

STUART: Yeah. Which is why the -- I kind of liked the light industrial or, you know, that kind of zoning because that, that wouldn't be the same as, you know, as just extending that commercial strip that exists now. So when I was kind of thinking out loud when I said the mixed use piece going right along in that spot there, I kind of -- I think just from a planning perspective I think maybe the light industrial would make more sense in that area.

LEE: As a staff we had a difficult time sort of cross-walking with the Battle Ground zoning because they have some mixed use employment and mixed use residential so it probably

doesn't translate the concept very well in our zoning. I do recall regarding specifically the employment uses in the steering committee, I think it was even shown in the preferred map from last summer, that there was a parcel, I believe it was the parcel south of 502, that the Board had actually changed from one of the earlier alternatives of a residential designation to an industrial designation because of the reasons that Steve discussed, being more easily access to the I-5 corridor.

STUART: Was it that the big the square one in the middle piece there or do you remember which one it was, Pat?

LEE: I think it's the one just south of 219th. I think it was that whole block of several parcels.

STANTON: Yes, it is.

STUART: And which would make -- I mean from just from a strict planning perspective would make sense, and kind of a community development perspective it would make sense.

LEE: I remember discussions in the steering committee Battle Ground's Mayor did not seem very receptive to that change.

MORRIS: Okay. All right.

STUART: So continuing forward or continuing southwest at the 179th Interchange, not much to say here. This is obviously also changed residential between 179th and 199th both on the west side and east side of I-5 appears to have been dropped off in the today's proposed map which we would be supportive of; however, if you are looking for residential area to add back in, the area on the northeast, on the north side of 179th between 179th and 199th and on the east side of I-5, that area we actually don't really have heartburn with phasing that area out. You know, we've said actually in our original proposal and our alternative that we had put together that area was a mix of residential densities and from low and medium densities, so as far as an area if you were looking to do swaps of land for residential, that is an area that may make sense. We see this long-term as a new -- frankly, we see this as a new city. We see this as the upper end of what Salmon Creek and Hazel Dell could become.

Eventually our hope is that either Hazel Dell is annexed by the City of Vancouver, which don't, we don't see as likely, or we see them incorporating as, you know, as their own entity, and what had prevented them before was they didn't have the job creation, in the mid '90s they didn't have the jobs to be able to support themselves. Well, with Legacy and with WSU Vancouver and with the job creation that is slated for the 179th junction expansion, we think that they very well could support themselves and become their own city and do quite well with it so. So that's an area that like I said, not much to say on it other than if you were looking for an area to add back in, that's something you might want to consider, although we don't have heartburn either way, we're happy enough to see it out.

MORRIS: Actually it's not an area I was planning to take anything out of, let alone add anything back in.

STUART: To take, you mean, yeah, oh, I'm sorry.

MORRIS: Well, when you talk about adding things back in I'm assuming you mean adding back in from the bare map up there?

STUART: From today's map there, yeah, exactly. Exactly.

MORRIS: No, no, I'm not, I'm not planning on going with that map.

STUART: Got you.

PRIDEMORE: Is that area ag land?

STUART: No, it's not.

MORRIS: No.

STUART: It's not. No. Yeah. Yeah, I would have marked it otherwise but let me check just to be sure. No, it's actually all urban reserve right now and not designated ag.

PRIDEMORE: Urban reserve overlay.

STUART: Urban reserve --

MORRIS: No, it's urban reserve and it has been in urban reserve for ten years.

STUART: Exactly.

PRIDEMORE: It's urban reserve zoning as well?

MORRIS: Yes.

STANTON: Are you going to go through all the maps?

STUART: Yes.

STANTON: Are you going to be here this afternoon anyway?

STUART: I could be, yeah.

STANTON: I'm just thinking, you know --

STUART: Do you want to take a break?

STANTON: -- we told an awful lot of people that we were going to take a lunch break and --

MORRIS: Right.

STANTON: -- they may be planning on coming in at 1:00 or 1:30 and I --

MORRIS: I was thinking I really should have asked you to start after lunch.

STUART: That's perfectly fine by me. My stomach would agree with you, so that would be fine.

MORRIS: Okay. Let's do that.

PRIDEMORE: I think we've got 15 minutes for lunch regardless of (inaudible).

MORRIS: Let's stop here and come back. Well, let's not reconvene here before 1:30 and I don't think in anybody's interest it hurts us to actually go for a full hour's break here, there's a lot of intense discussion so.

STANTON: We break now then?

MORRIS: Yes. Unless you are urging me to set only a half an hour for lunch.

PRIDEMORE: I'll second your proposal, Madam Chair.

MORRIS: Okay. We'll go for a full hour then. We'll reconvene at a quarter of 2:00. Thank you for coming back.

(Lunch break taken from 12:45 p.m. to 1:45 p.m.)

MORRIS: Okay. We're ready to reconvene the afternoon session of today's public hearing on updating of our comprehensive plan. We had ended the morning midstream through Steve Stuart's testimony and we had intended to begin again with him right after we reconvene; however, he's gone, so the old adage is you snooze, you lose. I guess we'll move right along. Dick Dyrland has signed up to testify, but there was also a note on my desk that he had to leave so I believe we have written comments from him. Carra Sahler and Duane Rose are signed up but they're not in the room either. So is John Morris here. Well, I know that Robert Schaefer is. Would you like to speak?

SCHAEFER: My name is Robert Schaefer and I'm with the firm of Blair, Schaefer,

Hutchison & Wolfe and I'm representing the Philbrook property which consists in your Map 7 of 127 acres between south of 139th and east of NE 50th Avenue. Your original proposal was --

MORRIS: Excuse me, Mr. Schaefer.

SCHAEFER: -- R-10 on this property. Go ahead. Did you have a question?

MORRIS: No, I just wanted to make sure I was looking at the right map. Thank you.

SCHAEFER: Okay. I believe it's 7. If I believe right it's Map 7 on your new --

MORRIS: No. Not on the ones I'm looking at at least.

STANTON: 10.

SCHAEFER: Am I right on the number or wrong?

PRIDEMORE: It depends on which packet we're looking at.

MORRIS: Yeah, it depends.

LEE: It's the --

STANTON: It's 10 in the latest.

MORRIS: Uh-huh. Okay.

SCHAEFER: Okay. When we -- the original proposal was that this would be an R-10 zone and it's now as you have done with many other parcels reduced this to R-7.5 as far as to create greater density. I think the thing that troubles the owners and the neighborhoods out in that particular area is that we went for almost weeks of testimony to try to find out what the surrounding area felt would be best use of the property and it was almost unanimous, if it wasn't unanimous I didn't hear anybody opposed to it, to the R-10 zone, and I think it's very hard for people to understand on this density situation when we're establishing a residential area when they have established homes that are in the same category to then all of a sudden after all the testimony even though we've gotten the capital improvements and you've gone through your different phases, to understand how we now get to a different zone after you've taken so much testimony and nobody explains this to the people in the neighborhood and the area. And it's troubling to me I guess as an ex-elected official that you're trying to -- you feel that you're almost forced to do some of these changes and I'm not positive that you are forced to do them. I'm not sure that you can leave these in the R-10 where they were established originally by your Planning Commission and by the testimony given by the people.

And so I guess I'm here to say that I'm troubled. I know the staff is trying to get the proper densities and established over all, but I think in the planning of this it's almost more important that we look to what the neighbors and the surrounding areas want and what creates the type of neighborhoods that people want to live in. And this is what you heard from weeks of testimony before your Planning Commission and we testified the same when we were here at your original hearings before this was continued, and I understand why it was continued, but I urge you to reconsider this to take it back to the R-10. Thank you very much. And I'm glad to answer any questions.

MORRIS: Comments?

STANTON: No.

SCHAEFER: Thank you.

LEE: I would note that the January 14th map showed it as R-1.75 (sic), not R1-10.

SCHAEFER: Thank you.

PRIDEMORE: If I understand this, the specific parcels that he's talking about are still R1-7.5, it's just the surrounding?

LEE: I am not sure if the complete parcels is. I think it's kind of an L-shaped parcel. Is that --

SCHAEFER: That's right.

LEE: And so I think that there might be, you know, one --

PRIDEMORE: So that one there would --

LEE: -- portion of that property that actually we did intensify on the map discussed this morning to from R1-7.5 up to R1-6 for just that portion, but we tried to keep the R1-7.5 buffer adjacent to the neighborhoods that have been involved.

MORRIS: I see Mr. Stuart's back so we'll take up with you again, Mr. Stuart.

DUST: Do you still want that one --

STUART: Yeah.

DUST: -- or do you want to go to the next?

STUART: Whichever one we left on, that's fine. Thank you, Madam Chair and members of

the Commission. Very sorry for being late and taking up your time with that. Kind of continuing forward where we were on the individual maps, the individual expansion maps, actually I think that unless there were any additional questions about the 179th expansion area I think we are ready -- I'm ready to move on to the next map. Okay.

So looking at the Felida area northwest segment of Vancouver, this is an area that we were looking at as far as additional expansion areas. You heard there's an arrow pointing down to an individual, individual property area in black ink and I actually made that note when one of the -- when the property owner came in and testified on the availability of that land for development. In looking at whether we're taking agricultural land or reserve land or what, wherever else we're looking to expand in, this entire segment of the, this entire segment of the county in gray there is urban reserve right now and none of it is being slated to be moved into the urban growth boundary. So if we're looking at areas to move in, this was, I simply wanted to raise this, raise this map as showing where, you know, there are some urban reserve areas that we have not tapped into. So if we are going to be taking agricultural land, according to the statute, according to the Growth Management Act, we need to first be looking at areas outside of agricultural land to be able to expand and we have some land that has been designated for a period of years now where landowners have known that this land was slated for urban style development so that if there was a need for any land to be brought in that this is an area that I would, I would hope that the Commissioners would look at. Again not -- I'm not advocating for any one parcel or any one area within this, simply pointing out the urban reserve area.

And I actually did have a question for staff on this map. On the section that is slated to go to R1-20 on the far west, not that one, right there, I actually didn't know what the current -- what is the existing zoning there?

LEE: This is, this -- Mr. Stuart, you originally proposed that this should come out of the urban growth boundary entirely?

STUART: Yes.

LEE: The existing zoning is actually R1-20 so we've sort of kept the polygon and filled in the zoning as what it is currently, the R1-20.

STUART: Okay. Okay. That's what I wasn't sure, if it was or was not so. All right. And we had suggested that simply because there are a lot of those lands that are steep slope, very constrained, areas that are actually still being used for small scale agriculture along that area that we would very much like to, to have maintained in that state, whether that's R1-20, and just continuing what's going on there or having it excluded from the urban growth boundary. Either way, however, we can somehow maintain that for -- it actually presents a really nice quality of life factor for the people living in Felida and living in, you know, in the Salmon Creek area. I know that I certainly have family that live there and we very much enjoy that area so.

MORRIS: Actually, Mr. Stuart, you and I were complicitous in that request. Mine primarily because there's simply no way to get people in and out of there.

STUART: Yeah. Yeah. And actually, Commissioner Morris, you had mentioned to me a while ago about that, the access, the ingress and egress, that it -- how difficult it would be to do any sort of, any sort of development in there and after having kind of gone in there after you had mentioned that, I absolutely agree, absolutely agree. Go ahead, next map. By the way, again for the record my name is Steve Stuart and 300 West 23rd Street, Vancouver.

MORRIS: Oh, excuse me, I'm going to interrupt you just one second. Apparently Louise had put a note by the sign-in sheet that said we were reconvening at 2:45 instead of at 1:45, so we'll take who's here for public testimony now and then we'll have to come back at 2:45.

PRIDEMORE: If we can ever leave by 2:45.

MORRIS: Well, that's right, but from the looks of the audience it's very likely that we might. So, okay, if you'd continue. Thank you.

STUART: Okay. So looking at this map we're looking at the 50th/72nd Avenue with 119th on the southern boundary, on the southern border of this, right there. Mr. Printz testified earlier today about the red and brown portions of that segment that Evan is, is circling right now. We are certainly in agreement with Mr. Printz that, that having instead of the brown of mixed use on the, on the, on that segment right there that that might be very appropriate for light industrial or office business park. Looking at the red section, the commercial section, we're somewhat in agreement with that. He had hoped to potentially have that entire segment be light industrial or business park which could be fine. One of the things that we had proposed originally was actually phasing, somehow transitioning in that area using mixed use on -- what is now the red portion using mixed use on that portion and on the brown portion having that be the light industrial or business park designation. So however you wanted to change that we do think that it makes sense to take the red section that is currently slated for commercial and just take that out and replace it with some form of either light industrial business park or mixed use given that there is a commercial node just to the west of it, slated to be just to the west of it, and there are other commercial opportunities elsewhere in the near vicinity. Regarding the rest of that segment we, our members and others in the neighborhood associations to the west of the larger section there, Evan, the big piece that's residential is what I'm talking about now.

DUST: Here?

STUART: That, exactly, that entire piece we'd certainly have a lot of people testifying from the neighborhood associations that they wanted to see -- especially along 50th see that area kept residential and we are very pleased to see that that is exactly what has happened and have no concerns or heartburn with that at all. And that's it on that one unless you --

LEE: Just, I'm not, and maybe I didn't follow your remarks, but actually Randy Printz representing Gramor has always wanted the red piece as a commercial.

STUART: But he wanted that piece as commercial?

LEE: It was only, it was only the -- he was only testifying to the mixed use piece that he was interested in changing to industrial.

STUART: Got you, okay. So the 117th hub here, here's an area where we actually through testimony have seen a couple of areas where we may be able to recapture jobs land lost in other agricultural areas. The area east of 117th and just north of 119th, the area that where you have very recently heard testimony from landowners that they would like to be brought into the urban growth boundary, we actually agree with their request. There are some agricultural lands. The land that they're speaking of is actually designated as agricultural right now because it's the area just north of the gray urban reserve piece; however, that entire area being that it is located very close to the 117th/SR-503 corridor and it is along 119th which is slated -- at least to the west of 117th slated for expansion, and given that there will be a commercial node on the northwest corner of that intersection, we believe this could be another good jobs hub for Clark County, specifically looking at an area -- at another jobs area so that this does not become another commercial strip.

We've already seen it as we're moving north toward that intersection along SR-503, it is absolutely just a retail strip and to see something other than that in that area, to see some other kinds of jobs produced would be a great benefit to the community in the area. So that's an area that we, we would, we would certainly be supportive of to include for jobs, especially given a reduction of agricultural acres elsewhere especially in Ridgefield and the Boschma properties. As far as the rest of the piece on this map goes, given the new, and I keep going back and forth between maps, but under today's proposed map, there we go, thank you, under today's proposed map if you look on the east section in the area that was that blue section right there, that entire area where it is outlined is agricultural land. The estates on the north edge have been taken out in today's proposed map, but there are still some large parcels that are proposed to be brought in. Those areas are still full functioning agricultural land and provide a nice buffer between urban and rural uses, we would very much like to see those agricultural lands removed from the expansion area.

MORRIS: Excuse me. Is that all of that area is currently zoned ag?

STUART: Yeah. All of the -- all of that area that Evan is drawing around with his pen is currently ag.

MORRIS: It's been so long since we've looked at a map that didn't have colors on it.

STUART: Definitely. And that's all I have on that map. Okay. The 162nd map, very

concerned about the agricultural portion that Evan is circling right now. Full functioning agricultural land, the environmental constraints in the area that is slated to be brought in at, not brought in but to have an industrial reserve overlay placed on it, we're very concerned that even eventually this land is not going to dry out. This is land that is environmentally constrained to the point where you're just not going to get much out of it and it does provide an excellent buffer on the east side of Vancouver. One of the things that, you know, that we have concerns with is just running our cities together and we've already, and we already have a situation just south of that in Fisher Swale where there's not much that can be done about it, it's just about run together now, but if we keep moving Vancouver to the east in this area and keep moving Camas to the north, then eventually we're going to have the two cities coming together even further north than they already do. That property, the properties that are currently in ag that are slated to be placed with an industrial urban reserve overlay, we would like to see just left out and not have an overlay placed on it and to continue to be able to have that in agriculture.

The remaining area, there is a small -- there are some parcelized areas where Evan is pointing out right now that are slated to be brought into the urban growth boundary of Vancouver that are currently agriculturally designated, we would also like to see those areas brought out of the boundary. Those are areas that if you look just to the west of that there are some, some residential areas just to the west of it, but as you look to the east of it, you're looking at some larger parcels. You're looking at what truly, what truly is rural area and so to provide a buffer between urban and rural is again very important for us and to provide some sort of agriculture, agriculture, whether it be small scaled or large on the, on the urban fringe just outside the urban boundary, provides us a base where children, parents, people can go and get their produce locally, people can go and actually have that piece of life-style. And I don't -- I am certainly not an advocate of keeping a rural life-style just so that someone can come out and look at it, but if we have productive agricultural areas, I certainly think that there is a, there should be a vested interest in keeping them.

MORRIS: Again do you know if that's being used?

STUART: The area, I know the larger area is. There are two parcels I know of in the brown area that are, but the rest, the rest I'm not sure, those are ones I can check on.

MORRIS: Do they raise things that you might just go out there and buy for dinner?

STUART: They don't have, they don't have roadside stands that I know of. They have CS -- at least one of them has a CSA and that people can buy, buy their agricultural products through them, you just don't -- you get them -- you go to the Dairy Queen and that's where you meet them and you get your produce from them.

LEE: Actually there's a property owner there that leases land to the Andersen Farm for part of that operation and that would be just, just above sort of the gray area in the middle, Evan, yeah, just above that, that brown piece, and the same property owner actually owns the

L-shape parcel surrounding that gray piece and they've indicated that they currently lease to the Andersen Farm, but that they are interested in a conversion at this point.

STUART: As far as the Fisher Swale plan goes, obviously a lot of work has gone into it from the County standpoint and both the Cities of Camas and Vancouver. And the only piece that I would even speak to is the piece on the northern edge of Fisher Swale which is the area that is, that is circled is agriculturally designated; however, I have seen them -- I have seen the master plan for the proposed development in that area and certainly as proposed that development would do a very good job of buffering Lacamas Creek and buffering against, buffering against any sort of environmental degradation and also provides a really nice mix of densities, both low density housing, higher density housing, park areas. It actually is a wonderful plan and if that plan is executed, we feel like that the neighborhoods would be, would be very pleased with what they would see.

MORRIS: What if it isn't?

STUART: That is the danger, I mean, and that certainly is, is something that, that we're concerned about is that what if, you know, the master, a master plan is just a piece of paper and it certainly can be changed. Certain -- we do have protections as far as Lacamas Creek and as far as the watershed goes, there are environmental protections, there are other laws that come into play, regarding the development pattern itself I wish I could say I felt a hundred percent certain that it would, it's going to happen that way, I don't, but my hope is it does.

MORRIS: Questions?

STUART: I think that's pretty much it. There was Camas and, Camas and Washougal but I don't think there was anything on either of those, there wasn't anything on either of those maps that I had, that I had marked. Certainly nothing that was being brought in was zoned agricultural without any sort of urban reserve overlay. So that's all -- go ahead.

PRIDEMORE: There has been some discussion about the Green Mountain property. Are you not taking a position with regards to that?

STUART: I'm privy to the discussions of Green Mountain. The discussions had centered around some sort of mixed use environment surrounding the golf course, somehow leveraging the golf, you know, the placement of the golf course to produce some sort of residential/commercial mix that might benefit with Camas as a community, I haven't seen the exact size of the expansion area that they're proposing. Or I've seen it in different forms and I'm not sure exactly what they would be proposing, if they're are talking about doing a mix, you know, some sort of mixed use environment directly surrounding the golf course that that, that would be something that is easily serviced and that actually -- and that does not create additional pressures for infrastructure development including schools, then I would, I would think that our Board might be supportive of that, but I honestly cannot say because our Board has not discussed it.

MORRIS: Other questions? Thank you.

STUART: Oh, no, problem. Well, and just to kind of conclude that I just wanted to just kind of reiterate that what we're hoping to do is to help come up with a plan that helps save the County money and that preserves the limited agricultural land we still have, that we can phase in growth without shutting down our economic, economic development engines, and then attach to that low hanging fruit that we have to make sure that we can leverage it for future development. We want to continue being a place that people want to live in and want to go to and preserve that mix of life-styles that, that we all enjoy.

MORRIS: Thank you.

STUART: Thank you, Commissioners.

MORRIS: Any chance John Morris is here by now? Okay. Then I also don't see Carra Sahler. Is there anyone who hasn't signed a sign-up sheet who would like to speak at this time? Please, Mr. Rademacher.

RADEMACHER: Good afternoon. My name is Gary Rademacher. My address is 19619 NE 68th Street. And I just mainly want to speak against the 180-day holding time. I do not believe it's necessary. According to Mr. Pat Lee, once the GMA is adopted they have 60 days to implement it, that will make it nine years ten months, I think that's long enough to wait. When staff asked for a fee increase like they have over the past three times in the last four years, we don't wait 180 days for that. The third, the third thing that businesses look at before they come into a city is the cost of housing for their employees and I sometimes think we forget that. Our cost of housing is as you know getting a little bit out of hand, but we all know that lots have jumped 25 percent in the last year, but an -- I had an interesting call the other day from a person that I sold a home to in Camas, a 2200-square foot home ten months ago in October, and they have to move again because of job reasons and they've resold that home in ten months for 42,000 more than I sold it to them. And so it's not just the strain on the availability of new lots, it is, it is the strain on the existing housing too going up. The realtors no longer tour, most realtor firms no longer tour because there's not enough inven, new inventory monthly to retour, they just tell them where they are and let the people go look at the new listings. So I'm just here to voice my opinion on the 180-day hold, I do not feel it's necessary. Is there any questions?

PRIDEMORE: Just on the affordability issue. There are communities like Atlanta that don't have any growth management kinds of things and yet the housing costs in those communities are going through the roof as well. I recognize just as an old economic student that there must be some link between land availability and demand and all of those things, and yet there, like I say there's communities that don't have our kind of restrictions that are still experiencing the same phenomenon. And I'm not -- just more an observation than --

RADEMACHER: Right. I'm really surprised with the San Diego and the Las Vegas area. You'd think the San Diego area would have backed off a little bit with the high tech hit but it has not. It pretty much comes down to most people either want to live on the West Coast in this country or they want to live on the East Coast and that just seems to put undue pressure on both coasts.

PRIDEMORE: It seems like there's a lot of people who either have a lot more money that they're willing to dedicate toward housing or they're able to dedicate toward housing that that seems to be part of the impacts as well.

RADEMACHER: And one other thing. If you do form a task force on that mixed use, I as a private developer would like to be on it. Thank you.

LEE: Oh, could I ask Gary a question?

RADEMACHER: Sure.

LEE: Gary, I think some of the parcels you're interested in at least on the map we presented this morning suggest increasing from an R1-6 to an R1-5 density. Is that an issue with you?

RADEMACHER: I have no problem with that as long as we get off dead center. I've been an advocate of the bigger lots through the years, but what it has boiled down to is that those parcels are far and few in between and, you know, we're forced to a higher density to save our farm ground and to accommodate building, but I have no objections with the R-5.

MORRIS: I can't imagine that any developer would object to a higher density, make more money.

LEE: Well, if we made it an R-30 they might.

RADEMACHER: No, I fought the R-6 for a long time and then I seen the writing on the wall, that was pretty much all that's going to be around to develop so. Any other questions? I guess not.

MORRIS: Thanks.

RADEMACHER: Thank you.

MORRIS: Okay. I don't see any new faces. Well, wait a minute, are you John Morris by chance? Okay. Would you like to speak?

STEVENS: Sure.

MORRIS: Please.

STEVENS: Baz Stevens, 26703 NE 77th Avenue, Battle Ground, Washington. Thanks for giving me the opportunity, Commissioners, appreciate being here. I'm--

MORRIS: Excuse me one second. Did you happen to sign in on a sign-in sheet at the back?

STEVENS: I didn't.

MORRIS: Would you mind doing so as you leave --

STEVENS: Sure, no problem.

MORRIS: -- just so we have a written record. Okay.

STEVENS: No problem.

MORRIS: Okay. And could you give your name one more time.

STEVENS: Sure. Baz Stevens. Do you want my -- the address again? I live in Battle Ground.

MORRIS: Oh, thank you.

STEVENS: I'm an advocate for the East Fork of the Lewis River. I wanted to stop by and I understand you're entertaining some sort of a, quote, unquote, compromise and I wanted to speak to you a little bit about the history of Battle Ground's attempt to rezone or extend their urban growth boundary. Battle Ground had -- the Mayor and the Council had a hearing, months ago now of course, to entertain their proposed plan and at the final meeting for that 40 people showed up to testify, 38 of whom will speak to the, 37 of whom approximately will speak to the point of view that I'm here to entertain and only 3 people spoke for the plan that Battle Ground wanted to propose at that point in time and still are proposing today. Two were -- or one was a landowner, one was an attorney for either that landowner or a group of landowners, and the third was the Chamber of Commerce speaking to support the Mayor, although one of the City Council members indicated that no vote was ever taken with the Chamber of Commerce because they themselves was a member of the Chamber of Commerce and didn't have an opportunity to consider that.

37 people approximately spoke in favor of, these were the Department of, State Department of Fish and Wildlife, professional hydrologists, local landowners, local river advocates, the local volunteers, et cetera, all expressing the strong need that development and move, pushing the boundary, the northern boundary of Battle Ground towards the East Fork would irrevocably harm the East Fork. Department State and Wildlife folks were talking about keep it miles away if you can. I think most of us then decided to find some sort of compromise here with miles away and what would in fact clearly impact the East Fork and had determined

that that road 239th Street where we had this kind of by line, draw the line at 239 kind of a saying, if you will, kind of a catchy phrase. And I know that there have been others that have testified recently as well to try to remind you the importance where, where as a county, as yourselves as Commissioners, you've spent so much time in trying to protect the East Fork and purchase properties and develop parks and provide recreation opportunities for our citizenry and we're here to say and as, you know, as peaceful a voice and as loud a voice as we can that allowing development north of 239th in the actual watershed of the, of the East Fork is going to in this particular case this one piece of property is interrupting the Manly Creek Road or Manly Creek and groundwaters and surface waters that feed the East Fork, our flows continually go down, we want to change that around.

If you went into -- I had this concept of compromise. If you went into a shoe store and you have a size eight foot and someone said, well, here's a size six, try it on, you'd say, well, it doesn't fit. Well, they said here, here's a size seven, why don't you compromise, we'll just chop off a little bit of your toes, that's the concept that we're feeling with the East Fork. There's a certain point where you can't compromise, you must say here's a line, it's important to protect the East Fork. All of the knowledgeable people, the concerned people, the advocates, the people who have devoted their lives and their volunteer energies and their professional lives to making it and offering you an opinion, I think it's shameful that you'd consider pushing that aside for the development of one piece of property. Please consider that. Thanks so much. Appreciate your time.

STANTON: Well, for, just a second, for a while there I understood you were talking about lopping off the whole part north of 239th --

STEVENS: Well, I think --

STANTON: -- until the end you said one piece of property. Is there --

STEVENS: Right. Thanks for clarifying, I appreciate that, Commissioner Stanton. I'm going to have to refer to my notes now because I know we've gone through compromising as well. This is the Friends of the East Fork's perspective here among all the others, we're just advocating for that. The boundary defined by two north, 239th Street on the north up west of NE 112th and north of NE 244th Street and west of Highway 503. So there is one parcel I think north of 239th that does impact the Manly Creek Road. Are you all familiar with the piece that I'm referring to?

LEE: Well, I think Evan was pointing to the piece that last week other representatives of the Friends of the East Fork suggested was the critical piece. And I guess --

STEVENS: (Inaudible) that piece right there?

LEE: Yes. Yeah.

STEVENS: And that's the critical piece west of isn't that 503?

STANTON: Okay. That's mostly your concern?

STEVENS: Yes.

MORRIS: It's that single piece then?

STANTON: Yeah.

STEVENS: Yes.

MORRIS: Because the City already goes beyond the 239th on the east.

STEVENS: On east of the -- east of 503?

MORRIS: Right.

STEVENS: Yes. Yes.

PRIDEMORE: Some west too. Isn't that purple piece already in?

MORRIS: No.

STANTON: No.

LEE: No.

STANTON: No, I don't think so.

MORRIS: Only the light yellow is in the city now.

STEVENS: Correct. Is that clear?

STANTON: Uh-huh. Yes. Thank you.

STEVENS: Okay. Thank you so much. Appreciate it.

MORRIS: Thank you. I still don't see a face whose name I can't bring to mind, so I'm assuming Mr. Morris is not here yet. Is there anyone who arrived who would like to speak? Mr. Horenstein.

HORENSTEIN: Just briefly, Madam Chairman.

MORRIS: Are you going to talk about the sewer issue or Mr. Lear's property?

HORENSTEIN: I can talk to you about that. Mr. Bowler believes that the sewer, that he can assist in bringing the sewer down to that Lear property. He doesn't see that as a big issue. You're opening up a whole corridor there, he won't be the only one participating, so that's, that's the message. It was the message he had me give Battle Ground about three weeks ago and when they were looking at the whole Meadow Glade and what to take out and what to leave it and I called him and he said we can work it out. It's actually just across 503, that is a different drainage basin so that may create some issues. And if that doesn't work, it will just have to come from the south through quite a bit of developable property. That's one issue.

The second issue is I had a question for staff. The Parker properties to the east of 117th along 119th, I think you told me this morning that we were going from R-6 to R-5 and I just got a look at that map and I think if I pegged right where they are it's R-30. And you --

MORRIS: But let me just clarify. We haven't decided to do any of that yet, but that is the latest copy of the map.

HORENSTEIN: I'm sure glad to hear that. My message on that if that's true is that there are -- there is enough wetlands on that property that we would never be able to do an R-30 development. We can do R-6 or R-5 and still leave a fair amount of wetlands, but when you start putting in this kind of density and the impervious surface it requires and that sort of thing, it becomes a whole different ball game. Now it could be I'm not reading the map right but --

LEE: It was site-specifics 2002-052A and 2002-052 so I guess those are the two. And it appears, it appears that those are east of the line of the eastern most portion of that industrial reserve next to the, yeah, right in -- it appears that they are in that area according to my map which would be the R1-5.

HORENSTEIN: Where is, Evan, where is 117th? Okay. Well, that may be.

STANTON: According to the maps that you gave us this morning it's in that R1-5.

HORENSTEIN: Is that right?

STANTON: Yeah.

HORENSTEIN: Okay. All right. I just wanted to be sure about that because I didn't want you to believe that you were going to get density that the wetlands would preclude you from getting. And then just the last thing to complete the record I have maps of the Discovery Corridor as proposed by the EDC committee and some of us individually.

MORRIS: Mr. Howsley, in that, on this map, the latest one, what was the area that you said is

wet?

HOWSLEY: Unfortunately my paralegal took that map home that I had mentioned earlier.

PRIDEMORE: It's the area just to the south that Mr. Horenstein was just pointing at.

HOWSLEY: Yeah, if you'd hold on just a second I can see if I have another one. Actually this has Mr. Horenstein's properties on it also.

STANTON: I think the problem was that it was upside down when it was over there so it was a little bit hard to orient.

MORRIS: I'm looking for parcels that look anything like that on here. Do you want to take this back?

HOWSLEY: Surely.

MORRIS: Would you take this one with you too and draw it on that and so I can tell. Thank you. Did you have other remarks?

HOWSLEY: I just wanted to briefly respond to some comments made by Mr. Stuart, specifically on that, on this, on this area that you were just looking at. Can you bring up 119th map. Steve was specifically talking about some properties to the south of 119th that were part of my request that you, that you heard earlier this morning that are under currently zoned agriculture and you just saw the wetlands contained on, on the site that has been delineated by Mr. Gross at the Resource Company. I just would like to remind the Board that in November I believe that I had submitted some very thick booklets and within those booklets that there contained a lot of our legal arguments for some of these parcels and in there was a discussion specifically addressing the agricultural use of these, of these parcels. Specifically GMA provides that agricultural land be primarily devoted to commercial production, that the property must have long-term commercial significance, that long-term commercial significance under the statute includes growing capacity, productivity, soil composition, the proximity to population areas and so forth.

These parcels would be logical to be converted over to urban use considering the amount of wetlands on, on the property, the soil composition obviously isn't appropriate for growing any agricultural products on it and its proximity due to the existing urban area should make those properties become urban. There's a more full discussion in the notebook if you would like to refer to it. Thank you.

MORRIS: Anyone else?

JACOBS: Hello. I had not prepared to testify today, I'm just back from vacation but I understand Mr. McKibbin was unable to speak last week. Addison Jacobs from the Greater

Vancouver Chamber of Commerce, 1111 Broadway. We did submit written testimony a week or so ago with some of our continuing concerns in regard to the jobs to population mix and our continued concern that there is not enough zoned commercial property in this plan for the next 20 years to produce the jobs that are necessary in the 20-year window and beyond, but I won't get into a lot of those things. I wanted to primarily address mixed use because you had some comments this morning that I'd like to concur with.

Both Mr. Printz and Mr. Horenstein recommended or suggested a task force on mixed use and I would very much underscore and support that recommendation and would be very happy to participate in that as the Greater Vancouver Chamber. There are certainly some concerns about the viability of the ordinance in actually achieving the goals that are set for those mixed use zones and since there's over a thousand acres that are being proposed for that zoning, we'd like very much to see that those produce the jobs that you anticipate, so we'd like very much to be a part of that. So I hope that you consider that at going forward. So that's the extent of my remarks. I was not prepared to present anything to you. I came back from vacation and found out that you had not heard from us.

MORRIS: It's all right, short is fine.

STANTON: Actually John was here on -- when did we, when did we adjourn?

LEE: Wednesday.

MORRIS: I think it was Wednesday.

STANTON: Whatever day it was --

JACOBS: Wednesday, yes.

STANTON: -- and he just chose to defer until today maybe knowing he'd be gone and I was so looking forward to --

JACOBS: I knew there was something to this.

STANTON: -- discussing the letter with him but I just can't do it to you, Addison.

JACOBS: Oh, please. Oh, please.

STANTON: It's very marked up.

JACOBS: In which particular regard?

STANTON: Well, just I think you guys know that you're kind of singing to the choir when you come and talk to us about jobs because I think we started that, probably wrote the words

to the song about six years ago when we had our first economic development conference. One of the things that we're up against, though, is Cities lack of interest in having a no net loss policy and I know you're primarily -- even though you're the Greater Vancouver Chamber, you're primarily in Vancouver, but I wondered if you had done any work with other Cities to try to encourage that kind of a policy or how you feel about the policy just in general.

JACOBS: Well, I think that, no, we have not done much work with the other Cities. We have done some work with Vancouver, excuse me, we certainly could spend a lot more time with that, and I think it's important that, that we have a no net loss policy because we can't afford to lose any further economic opportunity, but we certainly could put a lot more emphasis on that and would be happy to do that.

PRIDEMORE: I don't want to take you to task either. Just as a comment, and feel free to respond but don't feel obligated, but what troubles me with the Chamber's proposal, just with what we have mapped right now we're talking about jobs growth several times faster than has occurred at any point in Clark County history --

JACOBS: Correct.

PRIDEMORE: -- with the exception of World War II. What you guys have advocated for is significantly greater than that still and I hope we achieve that. If we do start to achieve that we can adjust in five years, we can adjust it I mean every five years so that we constantly have a new supply coming in. I keep worrying about us putting all the jobs growth out on the fringes and leaving a lot of good -- first off some investments that people have made inside the urban growth boundaries, but also just leaving parcels sitting there unused, so that's, that's one concern I have about that. And the other --

JACOBS: With, within the urban growth boundary you're saying?

PRIDEMORE: Yeah. I mean I'd like to see the places that we have inside urban growth boundaries develop, you know, we start to see that as long as we don't have a whole lot of stuff added to the outside. The other thought on this is the Chamber has consistently argued for us to increase the population forecast which would have an exact correlation with still a greater increase in the jobs to housing imbalance. It almost seems like you guys should be arguing for even tighter -- if we're trying to get that jobs to housing balance, then we should argue for even tighter residential so that we don't have to keep playing a game of catch up.

JACOBS: Right. Well, I think it just in terms of a balanced community we tend to be viewed as a bedroom community to the rest of the metropolitan area, and I think you have to turn and be a lot more aggressive if you actually are going to be fully interdependent and supporting and self-sustaining over the future years. So you do have to be fairly aggressive in doing that. In terms -- I don't know that we have accepted the population figure. You certainly have heard that that's, that's not the case because truly our history has proven a far greater growth,

but I think you have to plan aggressively going forward for the jobs to balance out over the long haul, and if it means that we need to look at 50 years out, then let's look at it with that view and we certainly have supported that viewpoint as well.

PRIDEMORE: And I'm a strong advocate for it too. It's just that you guys have argued for that we should take a historical perspective in terms of the population growth, but take a very nonhistorical record in terms of the jobs.

JACOBS: Right. Well, how do you--

PRIDEMORE: And they both conclude with just the largest possible expansion of the urban growth boundary and that that's what I'm struggling with.

JACOBOS: I understand. And I certainly understand redevelopment and the need for that and I don't think we have put that aside either. But I think one of the things that needs to be fully factored in is the market and what the market will bear and what the properties will allow to occur within a 20-year window of time.

STANTON: One of the things you talk about too is the lack of what you call commercial land, I think it's pointed out there are only 47 acres, and my question--

JACOBS: I think it's 43, yeah.

STANTON: Pardon?

JACOBS: 43.

STANTON: 43. My question would be how you define "commercial"? Does it just include retail or does it include professional offices, service sector, restaurants, those kinds of things that we're kind of incorporating? I mean we've got office campus/business park, what did you count, we've got commercial, did you just count commercial in that?

JACOBS: Yes. Yeah, in that, as far as I understand.

STANTON: Retail.

JACOBS: Well, retail and commercial development, yes. But it gets blended when you get out into the office parks, but that's the purely commercial piece.

STANTON: I'm glad you mentioned redevelopment and certainly vacancy rates are another issue, and looking at particular areas that have quite a bit of commercial retail available now that just can't even fill up. And I'm thinking of Orchards in particular where we lost some big retail businesses there as they moved out closer to the rooftops, so there's more potential.

JACOBS: Certainly there is more potential in the short-term, but I think you have to look long-term. I mean that's the point of the, of the plan is to look at 20 years. And you actually have to look beyond 20 years in making that plan and thinking as well.

MORRIS: Thank you.

JACOBS: You're welcome.

MORRIS: Mr. Rose, you are signed up to testify, would you like to speak next or are you waiting for Carra?

ROSE: No, I'm waiting for Carra, so can I defer until she arrives?

MORRIS: You bet.

ROSE: Would that be all right?

MORRIS: Oh, yes, absolutely. Okay. Well, we have about three minutes here until we're supposed to reconvene at 2:45.

PRIDEMORE: I know one thing we can do really quickly.

MORRIS: It's time to check --

SCHAEFER: Madam Chairman, can I make one comment, please?

MORRIS: Of course, please.

SCHAEFER: My name is Robert Schaefer and I spoke earlier today and I'd just like to make this one comment. I think that having the maps come out as late as they have and the number of people that have testified in all of your hearings and you've gone through, and I know it's been a very tedious and a very frustrating thing for the staff and for the Commissioners, but the notification of these when we were talking to people out there who haven't seen these maps that just came out are going to be very disappointed that they haven't had an opportunity to be able to comment on the changes that have been made, especially as to the density. And I think that I know you're aware of that, but I think we ought to be on the record at least that it is a concern of many of us that they haven't been placed on notice. Thank you.

MORRIS: Thank you. Yes, sir.

MR. MORRIS: Madam Chairman, I'm John Morris, I had signed up earlier and I had to leave.

MORRIS: Good, we're glad to see you. Please.

MR. MORRIS: Could I speak briefly?

MORRIS: Speak, speak, speak.

MR. MORRIS: Thank you. Thank you very much. I'm John Morris with Coldwell Banker, I spoke earlier today. I have another client concern, I represent Fred and Ethel Zeiler. Could you put up Map 11. And --

LEE: 117th.

MR. MORRIS: Yeah, 117th. It came up this morning that there was a possibility of reconsidering the residential zoning in that expanded area to be an R1-5 designation instead of an R1-6 and the Zeilers' parcel happens to be the parcel that already lies inside the urban growth boundary that's been redesignated to be R1-6. And the reason that that was considered at that time is that the expanded boundary would have created a small island of light manufacturing or light industrial property that would have been accessed off of 124th Avenue which would have been entirely residential along that area. The only reason for my being -- speaking on this right now is the R1-6 designation was to coincide with whatever the other zoning around it was going to be proposed to be. So I would suggest that if you're looking at creating an R1-5 designation in all the surrounding areas, that you also consider to make that an R1-5 parcel as well. Their parcel is 10 acres with an additional 5 acres to the south of them that they sold to the County for park land and it is currently Dogwood Park so.

MORRIS: Thank you.

MR. MORRIS: Okay. Thank you.

MORRIS: Yes, Eric. Are you here to defend the Boschma property?

SNYDER: Good afternoon, Commissioners. For the record Kevin Snyder, Planning Director, City of Ridgefield. We want to speak to you briefly about two issues. I'm going to take the first one and then ask Mr. Eisemann, the City's planning consultant, to take the second one. The first one pertains to the Ridgefield school site along Hillhurst Road. And thank you, Evan. What we wanted to do is to call to your attention that your current maps have a little bit of discrepancy and we want to call that out and ask for some consideration. The current draft comprehensive plan map that's been produced I think last week identifies that property as public facilities in a green color. The current draft zoning map identifies that property in a yellow residential zoning for zoning purposes and that's because currently Clark County does not have a public facility zoning designation that would be used for example for school sites. Throughout the planning process looking at this piece of property, this was one of the four areas that were included for additional analysis. The City and others involved have presumed that this property would be used for public educational purposes. The City would request that the Commissioners adopting ordinances in some form specify that the

property is to be used for public educational purposes only so as to preclude the nonplanned residential use of the property.

And just for your information I would let you know that upon annexation into the city at some point in the future, the City currently does have an -- currently has an urban public facility zoning designation that is used for uses such as school sites and would be applied to the property. So again the City is requesting that you clarify that the intent for use of this land is for public educational purposes only. And I have spoken both to Oliver as well as to Pat about this and was directed to bring this to your attention in this, this particular manner in a form of a question.

MORRIS: Is that coming into the UGB way out there? Is it? That's not in the map.

LEE: Yes, it is.

STANTON: Where -- yeah, it is.

MORRIS: What map am I looking at? It's not on that one.

STANTON: It's on the Ridgefield one.

MORRIS: Well, that map isn't completely colored in then. Okay.

STANTON: So we indicated just by putting it on the comp plan, although we've got --

LEE: We have a comp, we have a comp plan designation the same for the site. The Camas school site or in Camas with the Camas School District site in Washougal the same sort of designation applies. We have a public facilities comprehensive plan land use designation, but we do not as Kevin indicated have a (inaudible) zoning category so we typically apply what the typical adjacent zoning is and so in this case it's R1-6.

MORRIS: And so that would -- I'm not sure what it would require for us to do that beyond bringing it in on a contract zone. Do you own the property? Does the school district own the property?

SNYDER: No. The school district I believe is in the process of purchasing the property. Our concern primarily is that the property would inadvertently be surplus or somehow removed from its intended purpose for educational use which is what again the last six to seven months of planning effort has been focused on and Eric can certainly correct me if I'm wrong.

MORRIS: I understand that. But I'm struck by the similarities between this piece and the piece that we have had lengthy conversations about for Battle Ground and I'm not seeing a significant difference in the two except that they already own the property and you are optioning it. Are you optioning it? Have you signed the (inaudible) papers yet?

EISEMANN: Eric Eisemann, E Squared Land Use Planning Services, I'm not representing the school but I do not believe they have yet signed a contract. They do not own the property but they are in negotiations. The intent when the City Council agreed to bring that into the UGA request was that it be used exclusively for school purposes and no other use, and the concern that Kevin and I had when we looked at the maps out in the hall today is that in the future someone could say, aha, the comp plan says public facilities but the zoning map says residential, therefore it should be residential and that was never the City's intent, nor was it the school district's intent when it, they brought their request to the City. So we're just trying to fill a potential gap in the future.

MORRIS: I understand that, but nonetheless, whatever you're talking about is clearly relevant to the property that Battle Ground's been struggling over in the WSU area and I would imagine that that sort of an overlay has a significant impact on the price, does it not?

EISEMANN: I would, I would imagine you're correct.

MORRIS: I would think so. Okay.

EISEMANN: A footnote might be an appropriate way to deal with this in that the intent of the property on the zoning map is because the County does not have a zone, a corresponding zone, that the intent is to have the comprehensive plan designation hold over the zoning designation.

MORRIS: I'm not sure the footnotes in the plan are like budget notes in the Legislature.

EISEMANN: Yeah, I've never seen one. I'm trying to be creative.

LEE: Yeah, I don't know. It's -- you're right, it's an issue we don't have a real tool to deal with it other than the, you know, a covenant running with the land which is something that's been suggested in relation to the school district site. To the extent that staff recommendation on urban holding is applied which does not allow urban development, well, schools are allowed in urban holding though, so forget it, wrong track. I was trying to be creative too.

EISEMANN: More than anything else I think we just wanted to make sure that in the record today we've established the fact that the intent is it be school purposes as opposed to residential purposes.

MORRIS: Well, Mr. Lowry's coming up and scratching his head.

LOWRY: A couple of comments. First of all, if a sale ends up not going through, you can't leave property in a zoning district that doesn't allow any use. So even if the County had a public facility zoning, it would be inappropriate to put it on that facility if the property wasn't owned by a governmental entity for facility purposes. Second, it occurs to me that the City really is going to control this issue because this property will be in urban holding unless and

until it is annexed by the City and the City can make its decision that they're only interested in annexing it if it's going to be a school.

MORRIS: And is Ridgefield intending that everything added to the urban growth boundaries goes into urban holding?

EISEMANN: The City has had no objection to that in the past.

PRIDEMORE: Well, as far as it goes, the school, this could stay out of the urban growth boundary, the school could still be built and it would require a, you know, us dealing with the sewer, connecting to sewer issues, but they could still go ahead and build the school. I mean there's ways around this.

LOWRY: Right. There's, and there's been some discussion with the church office property to the north if there are problems with it getting annexed sooner than later, then there's again been some discussions about the possibility of it being able to develop while it's in the County under an agreement between Ridgefield and the County and that could occur here also. But again it seems to me that the City is in a strong position to control the outcome of this issue.

EISEMANN: I think the City's preference all along, the Council's request that's still on the record, is that it would like to have the property in the growth boundary so that it can control the future of the property. Perhaps this is less of an issue than we anticipated when we looked at the maps today.

LOWRY: One final comment. We would not be able to enter into a rezone covenant on this piece because it's not owned by the school district.

EISEMANN: Yet. The one last point that I was not intending to testify, but Mr. Stuart discussed the Boschma property in relationship to a land swap which I thought was an interesting idea. I would just remind the Board that in the record is a full capital facilities analysis of the Boschma property including streets, water and sanitary sewer, and in the discussions with the City and in the capital facilities material in the record, the developer has acknowledged the developer's obligation under the Ridgefield scheme of things as Commissioner Morris has discussed earlier this morning to assume the leadership role in the construction and the funding of all the essential public facilities needed to serve this property.

And I guess just as a final note I would, I would remind us all that an analysis, a capital facilities analysis, of property to come into the urban growth boundary is a good idea and that's exactly what the Boschmas have done in this case. I'm not aware that it's been done in the land proposed for the swap that Mr. Stuart indicated today. And that's all I would say on that.

MORRIS: As you were speaking it just crossed my mind, there's an area that I think it was LeAnne Bremer had asked for that just included the new arterial that we added.

LEE: The Pioneer Street extension area?

MORRIS: Yes. Where is that? So it is indeed in then?

LEE: Yes.

EISEMANN: The Pioneer Street extension is on the County's arterial atlas, but there are two small triangular pieces of property as the street would arc through the grid cities.

MORRIS: Those are the ones then?

EISEMANN: Yes. And those are the ones that need to come in in order for the City and the developer to build that street.

MORRIS: So they're still not in?

EISEMANN: They are still not in. There's less than an acre total in two small triangles. And then that if they came in, they would fully bring the roadway right-of-way into the City's jurisdiction.

MORRIS: Thank you. Questions? Thank you.

EISEMANN: Thank you.

STANTON: Oh, I do, but it's unrelated to what you've talked about. In going through my notes there's reference to Area 4. Do you know where that is in the Ridgefield plan, Area 4?

EISEMANN: Is that like Area 51?

STANTON: It said west side of NW 31st Avenue.

EISEMANN: Area 4.

LEE: I think that's the school/church site. Is that what we're talking about?

EISEMANN: That's the site, yes.

STANTON: In the doughnut hole?

LEE: Yeah. It is currently in the doughnut hole urban reserve designation. It is proposed in the January 14 map to come in. And I believe the proposal is by a church and they wanted to build a school associated with the church facility.

STANTON: Well, that seems really -- that seems kind of odd then because what I, what I was reading was the capital facilities report I think and it talked about the sewer having to be extended 3500 feet through rural property.

EISEMANN: It would have to be extended either down 45th, 31st or down a gravity line. Evan, if you'd just continue that to, let me draw it.

DUST: Where is the, where's the pump, pump station is at the bottom of the hill, isn't it?

EISEMANN: Currently the pump station is right here. The Cedar Ridge developer, I don't know if you can hear me or not, the Cedar Ridge developer is bringing in a gravity line that's coming all the way out to here and so the church slash school project would have to connect along this by gravity along Gee Creek tributary according to the current City sewer plan.

LEE: So that's going through the hole in the doughnut portion.

STANTON: I see.

EISEMANN: Right. It's either that or to stay within the growth boundary it would have to go up what we call 45th to the pressure line at this intersection.

STANTON: I see. Thank you. I can get rid of that note.

MORRIS: Mr. Rose, I see that Ms. Sahler was here and she's gone again. You'd better come now.

SAHLER: Excuse me, Oliver had a question for me. I'm here on the Battle Ground School District, WSU property, but before we begin that I thought I'd just go back to the Ridgefield School District property. That property is zoned ag so it really either needs to be rezoned or it needs to be brought into the urban growth area in order for the school district to put a school on that site which is the intended use of that property, so just so you keep that in mind.

And I should start, I'm sorry, my name is Carra Sahler from Preston, Gates & Ellis and as I mentioned I'm here on behalf of the Battle Ground School District. I have with me Duane Rose, the Assistant Superintendent for the Battle Ground School District. He's here to answer any questions you may have. So thank you for taking our testimony today. I'll be brief as I've met with each of you on this issue. As you know the District has been requesting that its property located on NE 174th and NE 50th or near that area be brought into the Vancouver UGA and it's been requesting that since the beginning of this process. There are a number of reasons for its request. Under the proposed comprehensive plan amendments the number of housing units that could be built in that portion of the Vancouver UGA that's located in the Battle Ground School District could be as high as 6,691 units. That translates to as many as 3500 to 4,000 new students generated from new development in the Vancouver UGA. If the County intends to concentrate urban population in the northern portion of the Vancouver

UGA, it must also anticipate service needs in that area. Schools are one component of the necessary government services that should be in place to serve development when it occurs.

Even should development not occur as predicted, the District may still need to site a school on that property. Pleasant Valley Primary School which serves students in that area has a small amount of capacity available, but the middle school is over capacity and students are housed in portables. As you know, the District plans to place a bond measure on the February ballot, although the District is not planning to pursue construction on this property as a part of that bond measure. If-- it may need the Mill Creek property if something goes awry with the other two properties it is intending to construct schools on. As you know, neighbors from the surrounding area have indicated a strong desire to initiate a land use planning process that would involve identifying appropriate uses for the area and preserving natural resources. In recognition of that objective the District has agreed to enter into an agreement and covenant. And you've seen that. It's been signed by the School Board Chairman, the agreement has been reviewed by the County's Prosecutor's Office, that agreement would limit the use of that property for five years to anything but a school, that's all it could be used for is a school.

The District has also agreed to participate in the planning process in the area. The next time this property can be considered for inclusion in the Vancouver UGA would be five years and that is only at the initiation of the County. The District needs to have the flexibility to use this property should the need arise in the next five years. Even if the District doesn't have the funding available in the next five years, the hearings process to amend the UGA is time consuming and expensive and it's best to take advantage of this opportunity now. Do you have any questions for me or for Mr. Rose? Okay. Thank you.

MORRIS: Here comes Mr. Lowry.

LOWRY: I just wanted to make sure that the Board is aware that what the covenant does is preclude the school from, District from using the property for five years for anything other than a school, it does not, however, preclude the District from selling the property to a third party and that --

SAHLER: But the third party could not use the property for anything but a school for the next five years.

LOWRY: That's not the way I read the covenant.

SAHLER: Okay. That's not how it was intended so we can work on that.

MORRIS: It's the way the covenant is supposed to read?

SAHLER: That's right.

MORRIS: The covenant is supposed to read that that property is coming into the urban

growth boundary and that it may be used for no other purpose -- it's coming in under the R1-6 zoning but it can be used for no other purpose irrespective of the owner for five years other than construction of a school?

SAHLER: That's exactly right.

LOWRY: Okay. Then we may, we may need to work a little bit on the wording.

SAHLER: That's fine, we'll be happy to do that.

MORRIS: Okay. Thanks.

SAHLER: Thank you.

MORRIS: Is there anyone else who would like to speak this afternoon? Anyone else who would like to speak this afternoon? Okay. Now I don't know whether we have a major decision here about closing public testimony or if we just end this session?

PRIDEMORE: It doesn't seem like, I think we need to leave it open. We have had a series of different maps. Maybe I should clarify. From my perspective we've only had a few maps that have actually been produced over this past several years that were in the sequence of new proposals. First was the five alternatives, second was the Planning Commission recommendations, third was our draft map from last January, that's the map that we're working from today, I think that this map today was in response to my comments last week about getting -- achieving the density goals and this is what you guys have said here's a way we could do this --

LEE: Yes.

PRIDEMORE: -- without rezoning anything inside, but that this is just one more stream of information coming in to us. But I think we need to leave the testimony portion open and see how big of changes, you know, are we going to incorporate some of these, I think that's pretty relevant, so to me I don't think we can close the record at this point.

STANTON: Fine, I don't mind.

MORRIS: And, Mr. Lee, you said by this afternoon you would have maps of the area around 179th that demonstrate the pieces coming out; is that right?

LEE: We could, we could probably produce that this afternoon, yes.

MORRIS: Okay. Okay. Well, then we'll close this portion of the public hearing for the day and we will not reconvene again until?

STANTON: I think it's tomorrow at 10:00.

LEE: Tomorrow at 10:00 I believe.

MORRIS: Tomorrow at 10:00, but I'm not sure that we have comp plan on the agenda.

PRIDEMORE: We do tomorrow.

MORRIS: We have appeals tomorrow.

PRIDEMORE: I think after 1:00 tomorrow we have comp plan.

MORRIS: I think we have hold for a comp plan on our maps, but I'm not sure if it's -- has it actually been --

LEE: We have the 10th.

MORRIS: -- announced?

RICHARDS: At 10:00. It's on the agenda of comp plan update at 10:00 after the appeals.

MORRIS: Oh, all right. Okay. So I guess we'll raise this discussion again tomorrow.

PRIDEMORE: It might be helpful, I don't know if you guys want to do this, I was thinking we could do some preliminary deliberations this afternoon perhaps after a break and talk about where we see things going so that if there are additional comments that somebody wants to make based on where we're inclining, that there would be an opportunity to do that tomorrow rather than leave everything up in the air and nobody really sure where each of us is thinking, thinking about at this point. There's issues like Meadow Glade, issues like the density, all of those things, so I would be willing to entertain doing that today if there was a desire to again after a break.

MORRIS: When we've had those kinds of discussions in the past, we usually haven't been sitting here, we usually have been in a less formal setting. Do you want to do it here?

PRIDEMORE: I almost prefer we do it here just so we stay more focused than it seems like when we go informal we've been less than clear about where we've left things.

MORRIS: Do you think we'll be clear today?

PRIDEMORE: I think I know I could articulate what I'm seeing with the map and all the different data that's come forward and where I'm feeling like I want to go with the deliberations, that's -- and I don't know that I want to deliberate today so much as give those indications, here's what I'm thinking and this is what I'm planning to push forward with in

deliberations so that that's clear for people who may still want to testify to specific aspects. We don't need to hear Joe Lear again if everybody's going to say, yeah, Joe Lear can come in, you know, we don't need to go through those, and if we could start focusing our conversations on the specific places that are still in debate, it might be useful.

STANTON: So you want to do the map work? I was getting the impression you wanted --

PRIDEMORE: Map work, policy work, numbers, where, whatever is out there that we can start either narrowing in or at least get people focused on what things we're each looking at.

MORRIS: I think we could certainly discover if there are areas where there are three. There comes a point in time I think when we need to have this discussion after we have closed public testimony because you know that every time we have a deliberation, we bring more people who have more comment and we're going to hear more about why we should not bring Joe Lear in. So I think, and Mr. Lear, if you're out there watching I just, we are using you because we have heard so frequently from you today. There -- I am beginning to feel that there must be an end to the discussion and that I am beginning to feel as though we have children getting married and we are trying to decide whether or not they have their menus planned for Thanksgiving six years out. There's a -- I think there is a time to -- I think there is a time for us to close the public part of this and, and move on and see what we can, can make with it. I'm not exactly sure when that is, but at least for me it's coming right along if it's our goal to get this wrapped up at any time soon at all and hopefully we'll be able to find out if we can get to two.

PRIDEMORE: I agree with that. I just don't want to have anything new suddenly come up that people could feel like they didn't have a chance to speak to a specific thing. I mean there's some things that for me could come off the table right now, it's just, it's done, but there's also the possibility that through discussions new things will come up that might change something in a significant manner and I was just -- and maybe the deal is we close public testimony but leave it open so that if there is a specific area or specific thing that we do in that deliberations, we could open up for that portion only so that we can start getting the other things out of the way.

MORRIS: Well, I guess that, I guess that I'm quite honestly of a mind that if we are, if we are -- that probably one of the things we ought to decide today is whether or not we are sincerely discussing the suggestions that came forward over the weekend, including taking out 500 acres around the Fairgrounds, because I've of a mind that that has -- that that ought, Mr. Lowry, to be renoticed, that is a significant change in the plan to suddenly drop 500 acres, which the only time that ever appeared in a map was in Map 3 which had very little serious deliberation or consideration by the Board. So if that is a potential that there are two votes for, then my suggestion is that we stop right where we are and we reopen that discussion again and we conclude whenever we can conclude.

PRIDEMORE: That discussion is broader than that because that is in reaction to the lack of

density currently proposed in the unincorporated Vancouver UGA and that gets to these issues of places where staff has suggested here would be an appropriate place for multi-family and those things which could if we don't want to take steps to bring ourselves in compliance with the policy that we ourselves set, that would make it easy, but my preference certainly would be that we meet the same policy objectives that we've set for the individual Cities and whether it's this plan or some other means of achieving our densities, I think we still need to address that.

MORRIS: I'm not saying that if that is the decision of two of the Board's that that is the top priority here. After everything else we've discussed that my point is then we need to develop a plan and renote it and we need to go through this process again. It seems the only fair way to do it.

STANTON: Boy, we may be doing this forever then because --

MORRIS: Yes, that's the point.

STANTON: -- I mean when I was going through, and I spent a lot of time doing map work this weekend and capital facilities work and just kind of taking a look at knowing what I know now, here's what I would do to shape the maps. And they would be different because I think I made it clear in January that my intent wasn't to bring all of that land in, it was to get boundaries where Cities could show us how they would provide capital facilities, Cities or special purpose districts. So I was of the opinion that we could get to this point, have our discussions amongst ourselves and make changes to the map, but not to send the map back out for another view.

MORRIS: Well, would you make changes to the map of such magnitude without sending it out for public review as our in the latest maps from Mr. Lee or the map -- we're missing one?

STANTON: Actually I was kind of--

MORRIS: I mean is that not a significant alteration in a map? And obviously if that is the intent, then it looks to me as though you'd have to have some consideration of the environmental constraints on those lands and their carrying capacity.

PRIDEMORE: Well, we're not even close to achieving our density goals so the reality is we either need to change the density goals, which is a major policy decision, or we need to change the map and I'm not interested in changing the density goals.

STANTON: Well, if we change them for us, we're going to have to consider it from the Cities.

PRIDEMORE: That would be the fair way to do it.

MORRIS: Well, wait just a second, let me argue the other side of that because the density goal is for the city UGB as a whole. If that is the Board's intention that we hit that, we probably should have specified that earlier and we probably should have had this, these numbers earlier than now. So I mean my point again is that, no, it never occurred to me that we would be making these kinds of substantial changes in the maps that, that we have seen.

STANTON: I guess if I was looking at the part that is unincorporated Vancouver and it were to become another city, my expectation for all of the land inside the Vancouver UGA was to achieve the eight units per acre. You're not going to get there with the numbers that we saw. If it was a new city would you not have made that at eight unit per acre? Well, I shouldn't ask you.

MORRIS: No, you shouldn't ask me about that.

STANTON: I know you don't agree with it. I mean I wasn't even supporting eight units per acre in Camas. To me this is the dense part of the county, so I would have to look at the unincorporated part of the Vancouver UGA as another city in my mind and it should achieve eight units per acre and we're not even going to get there with the map we saw this morning.

PRIDEMORE: My understanding was you would get there with this map.

LEE: Yeah. Yeah, I think --

PRIDEMORE: In the range at least.

STANTON: I thought you said averaging in with Vancouver?

LEE: No. No, if you take, if you take the, just the January 14th map, although you're underperforming in the unincorporated area, because the city is performing very well in terms of density, as a UGA at the very high end, you know, probably 70 percent to 100 percent into the range, you are up at the eight units per acre, but I don't know that we can point to a track record of having always performed at that end of the record. The map that we discussed this morning does in fact move that range up significantly and I think up to a level where there is certainly a much better opportunity to achieve the eight units per acre density than what the January map would allow us to do.

STANTON: Okay. So I thought you said 5.7 to 8.5 my notes say for the entire UGA, that's not what you meant? The unincorporated?

LEE: Yes. Yeah. And we're talking about the unincorporated portion.

PRIDEMORE: Well, this is getting (inaudible) for what I was talking about was us putting out this is the direction that this is going in. I do recall, Commissioner Stanton, you making it clear I thought we should have gone further in January in terms of narrowing into what we

specifically thought the map was going to be. You had a stated desire to still leave possibilities out there based on the capital facilities plan which I again would have preferred we had just narrowed it down based on the capital facilities information we had available at that time. We now have the capital facilities information, I think that clarifies the issue significantly more, but it does suggest that further map changes like removing Meadow Glade, those sorts of things, are still on the table and before we have resolved those or I mean we should get some indication of how we intend to resolve those things and still leave it open for the public to make final comments. Commissioner Morris talked about the major, potentially major changes around the Fairgrounds area, the area around Meadow Glade is just as significant for comment.

MORRIS: Well, it's a large area but we had a number of people who asked to be taken out too, so we are responding, we're talking about a rural center that was designated as a rural center, none of the area that we're talking about taking out here was ever designated as a rural center or as a large lot area. The further impact on the Battle Ground School District has not been discussed. A lot of this has to do with supposition about significant improvements to 72nd Street. We have lamented loud and long about the difficulties along 503 and yet I can't imagine that we aren't compounding them with this added density in that particular area. We are in fact removing the students from one of the more able school districts and we are transferring them to one of the least able school districts.

So that is not a factor that came into discussion in the delineation of this map. I asked Mr. Lee about that and he said it wasn't. We haven't heard from the school district about what difference that makes or what the additional population would be. I'm assuming that you have just as many children in an R1-5 and an -- as you have in an R1-.75 (sic) and you're going to have more of them so I think it is a very significant change in the map.

PRIDEMORE: So how do we want to discuss those issues?

MORRIS: Well, I think we pretty much are. I mean I think, I think that, that the first decision to be made here is how imperative is it to this Board that we achieve density. We said at one point in time that our priority was to preserve agricultural land and yet we didn't and we left out of discussion huge areas that have long been designated as urban reserve. We have the suggested remedy -- well, I guess the first thing is whether or not that is the top priority that we achieve those densities. And if it is, we probably should have identified it at some point in time earlier than this or we should have been told. So I guess I would have to say that it is not my top priority that we achieve that density level throughout the unincorporated area of the Vancouver urban growth boundary.

STANTON: And my top priority all along has been cost containment and in particular concern about the County taking on responsibility for more urban land to serve. So it falls into both of them. I mean that concern is answered by taking -- in some small measure by taking some of this land out. I can't recall where the line is between Vancouver and Ridgefield. Do you know school districts since you brought it up?

STUART: I have the map.

STANTON: I've got one in my office too, I was going to go look if we take a break, just flip through that. Is it right here? Is that 179th?

MORRIS: So most of this is in the Vancouver.

STANTON: This would be in the Vancouver. No. No, because Mt. Vista is in Ridgefield.

HIGBIE: 139th Street.

MORRIS: I wish we had a map. I mean I don't-- still can't tell what is suggested to come out.

PRIDEMORE: Well, maybe clarifying, I agree with you, Commissioner Stanton, in terms of those priorities. I think that we have gone the majority of expansion areas that we have looked at are into the existing urban reserve places. Granted there is a lot more urban reserve out there that's not being taken in, but most of the places we are taking in or at least proposing currently by this are inside existing urban reserve. So I think that we've, we've done well at pursuing that priority. Density is an issue. I think density relates directly to how much land we bring in, how much land we convert and develop. And the other issue in the capital facilities, the capital facilities needs are directly related to our population growth and what we're seeing particularly for the Battle Ground School District is a huge need for additional capital facilities that I don't know, I mean if it's \$4,000 every man, woman and child needs to pay in the Battle Ground area, not just from the city of Battle Ground but Battle Ground School District in order to pay for the new schools that are going to be needed over the next 20 years, that's a huge, huge hurdle to cross for a family of four and for me I would go as far as to revisit whether or not we can afford a 1.83 growth percent. So I'm struggling with all of those issues. I think all of those priorities are there's not one priority. If there was just one priority we could do this plan, but there's not.

STANTON: And I keep writing, I keep writing down all the priorities. This morning just from the speakers that we heard today I wrote down density in the Vancouver UGA, that the part that we're responsible for in the unincorporated part, cost containment, improving the jobs to population balance, Randy Printz's comment that annexation is far from a sure thing, and my continued concern, I went back and read the Sheriff's report that he gave to us some number of months ago and the need for the 47 new deputies and 112 custody people and all of that and it just no way the County can continue to come up with that money out of the general fund that is constantly growing smaller, impacts to the school districts and Battle Ground in particular, although at some point Battle Ground needs to step up to the plate, the folks in the district do, to pay for the facilities that they're short right now.

And then my other concern after the comments this morning is whether urban holding will

really hold up. And if it won't, then my inclination is to leave less land for new growth if it's -- if urban holding isn't going to hold up so that, so that development can be phased in over time with the capital facilities in place with the reasonable expectation that we're going to be able to fund, we or the Cities who do the annexing are going to be able to fund the services that will be required in that area. So I'm going beyond just the capital facilities, it's can you pay for the services as well. If urban holding isn't going to hold up until those things are in place, I'm less inclined to be adding land to urban growth areas.

PRIDEMORE: I don't if we --

STANTON: Because I keep looking at this thing --

PRIDEMORE: You just raised more questions.

STANTON: -- I mean but everything comes down as far as I'm concerned affordable housing is really important. I guess I feel my obligation to the people who bought houses here believing that it was going to be affordable to live here and I look at capital facilities plan --

PRIDEMORE: Evan, could you leave that up.

STANTON: -- and I keep coming up with urban facilities that are going to be -- or capital facilities that are going to be paid for through new bonds and expectation that new special purpose districts are going to be formed to pay for parks. I don't know how we're going to pay for Sheriff's Deputies, my guess is a new special purpose district and for schools and for a new jail. I mean everything that's going to be put out there for a vote means more money and so we're talking about either more taxes or more fees and the only one that I've seen come up with real specific fee related this is what you can expect is the Hazel Dell Sewer District who said that \$3.50 a month increase can be expected this year and for the next couple of years at least to pay for the increased cost of growth.

And so when I'm looking at costs I'm looking at in terms of affordable housing for families, I'm looking at those too, because I watched my own taxes when the Evergreen School District passed their very large bond and they went up and most people, I mean, didn't expect their taxes to go up. So their taxes go up for schools, their taxes go up to pay for parks maintenance that we're asking for, taxes go up if we have to find a way to pay for Sheriff's Deputies. We all know there's a bigger solution required for roads, taxes go up, fees go up. I don't know that people can afford to stay in the homes that they bought. That's part of the affordability of housing is just how do you pay the operating and maintenance expense of your own residence. So I keep coming back to the cost containment issue, that is my biggest concern, for government, for the impact on businesses as we talk about new utility taxes to pay for stormwater or Cities talk about B&O taxes, something to pay for the cost of growth or a street utility or whatever it happens to be, and the impact on the resident, the businesses and government in general, and what the taxpayers have been telling us through initiatives and votes on taxes that have been out there in front of them is I don't want to pay, so you got me

where the revenue is going to come from.

MORRIS: What do you want to do about it?

STANTON: I don't know for sure. I want to talk about the best solutions that you all see.

PRIDEMORE: I don't think we can do a whole lot with the cost, ongoing costs, I think we can do more to contain the infrastructure costs, one, by honoring our commitments to meet the density goals that we set for other jurisdictions, and, two, to look at what is affordable level of growth. We had a lot of conversation about what does GMA require in terms of growth management or in terms of growth, you know, the numbers and projections, do we have to meet what, what we think is -- truly what we think is most likely or do we need to honor the requirements of growth management that we pay for our facilities as we go. There's conflicting things here. To me, if we adopt a higher growth rate than we can afford to, to service, then we are literally sitting here today and planning for a worse community tomorrow and we're just accepting that and that's something that is going to be very hard for me to sit down here as we make final decisions, it's going to be very hard for me to say I'm going to pick something worse when I didn't have to.

STANTON: Even, even looking assuming grants say on transportation or some of the other facilities, it's still fiscally constrained and a recognition is clearly in the capital facilities plan at least in terms of transportation that the level-of-service will decrease. The number that I'm remembering is with the improvements that are in the capital facilities plan, congestion based on delay time is going to get seven times worse. Now to me that translates into a quality of life. Having run twice on trying to maintain the quality of life as my platform, I can't go there either.

PRIDEMORE: I have an easier time with transportation because I think we have an unrealistic expectation about what transportation is in a larger city. The fact is is larger cities become congested, they become congested whether they sprawl, they become congested whether they're condensed, congestion seems to happen. What I am much more concerned about is the impacts on schools and us overcrowding more and more classrooms, again unless if we don't have to. If we are required to meet as much population growth as can conceivably happen, that's one thing; if we're not required to do that, if we can take into account what we're going to do to our capital infrastructure, then my intention would be to take that into account and to balance that interest along with all of the other interests that we have as a community.

STANTON: Well, living with the congestion at an urban level wouldn't be so difficult if we had the transit system to support it and we're going to be asking for a new tax for that this Fall so --

PRIDEMORE: Replacement tax.

STANTON: I'm not sitting here assuming that's going to pass either. Pardon?

PRIDEMORE: Replacement tax.

STANTON: No, it's a new tax. I mean the reason that we built the Padden Parkway was related to the growth that was I think it was referred to earlier today as part of the Pipeline discussion. One of the solutions that was a part of that was to build the Padden Parkway which took a significant investment on the part of the County. I am concerned about the transportation deficits and I don't think it can all be resolved just with transit. But again, the last Board selected I believe the highest number that they could pick for a growth rate, didn't have the capital facilities in place or funded adequately, so whatever percentage we're picking goes on top of a high one that encouraged a lot of growth so -- and it's an average, I mean it's an average over a lot of time, 20 years, so it's not to say that it would change from today's current growth rate to a smaller number overnight. I don't know. It comes down to dollars and cents, I've known that all along, and it really is in the voters hands.

PRIDEMORE: That was the part of the discussion I thought should be on the table before we closed public testimony so I accomplished my --

STANTON: What? I felt like we just talked around in circles. What part --

PRIDEMORE: I don't think we've settled anything, but I certainly have clued in on what the areas that I'm looking at and what I'm thinking needs to be done for our final deliberations, so if somebody's got a particular heartburn with those areas, raise it.

MORRIS: Well, why don't you throw them on the table.

PRIDEMORE: Well, I guess --

MORRIS: First, first is this premised on a reduced population forecast?

PRIDEMORE: It's not premised on it; however, reduced population forecast would be on the table. I would specifically like to see the difference between the 1.5 and the 1.83. I would like to pursue these density goals, the targets that we've set, in earlier policy discussions, I'd like to look at the Battle Ground UGB expansion and consider whether those areas are the best places to expand.

MORRIS: Does that require renoticing, Mr. Lowry? It sounds to me like we're talking about a major revision again.

LOWRY: Again, what the GMA says is if you go beyond the alternatives that were listed in the EIS after close of deliberations, then you're required to reopen it.

MORRIS: So we can shrink the boundaries, we can reduce the population forecast and we

don't need to renotece?

LOWRY: Correct.

MORRIS: Thank you. Well, that moves us along at least.

PRIDEMORE: So those things would be out there for, for the conversation tomorrow if that helped. I don't know that everybody's hanging on what am I thinking, but that's one thought or concern, I would agree.

STANTON: Well, as was pointed out earlier, the focus on trying to improve the jobs to population ratio here is certainly something I've been interested in as I said for six or seven years. And I'm well-aware that there are two sides to that ratio. One is increasing jobs and the other is decreasing the population growth in order to more rapidly or at some point hope to achieve the kind of jobs to population balance that the Chamber spoke of in their letter and they wanted us to be more like the Portland metropolitan area and try to get to the one to two and certainly part of the way the metropolitan area is achieving that is to hold down their population growth. And I can't remember the number exactly that's being planned for in the Portland metro area, but it seems like it was 1.58 or something like that and I think the discussion that we had oh so long ago about what our population ought to be was based more along the lines of take -- not taking more than a disproportionate share of the population in Clark County. If we're going to hope to make to improve our jobs to population balance, certainly it's going to take both sides, it's going to take increasing the opportunities for jobs, but also trying to hold down any massive population increase or we'll never catch up.

So I guess I'm just saying I'm open to relooking at taking our share of the whole metro area with the hope that we can achieve what the Portland metro area is trying to do, which is to get more jobs here. I mean our surveys that we did early on had, what, 80 percent of the people who answered the surveys saying we needed more jobs here, that's my focus, that's been the whole effort behind the focus public investment plan because I mean we started out today talking about it, I'll continue to talk about it, we don't have the revenues, what used to be 106 percent over the prior years collections in property tax has been taken all the way down to 101 percent, there is not money left over. John McKibbin in his letter was talking about putting money aside and letting the levels-of-service drop over years to save up enough to do something. I mean we're sitting here, we're making decisions on -- every year when we pass the budget we're taking money out of the road fund, \$2.2 million a year if I remember the number right, to pay for Sheriff's Deputies, that's a maintenance expense as people who patrol the roads, meanwhile we're going to the Public Works Trust Fund borrowing money to build roads, we've never done that before.

I mean we don't have the funding available to be all things to all people and that's the side of it that the public doesn't see as much. I mean they continue to hear the rhetoric that we're just not spending our money appropriately, we've been finding every spare nickel and every spare corner to try to invest in infrastructure to cut the long, long-term expense. And we've done a

good job of doing that, but the well is running dry. We don't have the funding or the potential for funding to support what we have on those maps. I've known that, I knew it in January, I just wanted to see where the most cost effective place was to invest the limited funds that we have available and where other jurisdictions who are in the same fix that we are are going to find the funds to pay for the capital facilities. So there's not a whole lot left. There's get more money, decrease the level-of-service, or plan for fewer people, those are the three pieces we can mess with.

PRIDEMORE: Well, and the -- one of the objectives suggested by a few people in the business community was go ahead and let the level-of-service drop to the point, whether it's traffic or it's crime or it's schools, let it decline to a point where taxpayers are so concerned that they're willing to pay more and I guess I'm not willing to have quality of life go down that low that people are going to respond.

STANTON: Not when we have other solutions available to us. I mean that's what we're supposed to be doing with this plan. We're supposed to take a very responsible approach, talk about whether it is fiscally prudent and move on and there just aren't that many variables here. I agree, I'm not willing to let the level-of-service drop that low, it would be intentional on our part, we'd be sitting here saying not only do we know you have to pay more in fees, utility charges, taxes, but you also have to accept a lower level-of-service so we can accommodate a higher growth rate.

PRIDEMORE: Madam Chair?

MORRIS: Well, there's no sense in my participating in a discussion about reducing the population forecast or accommodating fewer people, so I'm willing to help the two of you struggle through it if you'd like. I can imagine this going on for a great deal longer given the turn of events in the discussion over the last few moments. If it -- if that is the inclination of the two members of the Board, then I would suggest you move immediately as far and as quickly as you can this afternoon in finding areas of common ground. I'm beginning to feel in this whole discussion a little as we did today about the sewers with Mr. Lear, that there is just no more possible information we can ask for from staff, and there is no point in my re-articulating the multiple arguments that I have articulated over the course of the last three years about the particular depression that permeates the discussion when you two talk like this.

And I understand truly that you believe that to be a reality, Commissioner Stanton, just as greatly as I believe that the financial participation of the private sector ought to be fully disclosed in all of our documentation. If you are intending now or at some time between now and the time there are two votes to adopt a plan to reduce boundaries, reduce population, I think you need to do it as quickly as possible and I would encourage you to do that for certainty at last so that staff can bring it into their interminable foreray into lands of indecision and that, that we at least bring a quietus to it. I would only caution you that shrinking boundaries and shrinking a population forecast in an effort to somehow or other achieve the

goals that you believe to be valuable is likely to do nothing but move us to a point where we do indeed hit 75 percent even quicker than I would predict it with the current expansions and I was predicting it in another five to six years. So I think you, I think you will certainly achieve a more rapid acceleration toward that 75 percent threshold. I think, Commissioner Stanton, that from the beginning are the hopes that urban holding would somehow or other resolve the capital conflicts probably was more wishful thinking than potential reality.

So I, you know, I don't, I don't have a way to participate meaningfully in a discussion about either reducing the population forecast or restraining the Cities efforts to determine their own destiny. And I, I certainly would not be able to support alterations in the maps that we have substantially been discussing for the last many months with the exception of the, of the withdrawal of the Meadow Glade area because it is a different sewer system, because it is a rural center, and because there were significant requests in that area. It's been my preference that, that we would be able to indeed wrap this up. I think if we are going to wrap this up quickly, that it is going to be really up to the two of you to agree very expeditiously. I will let you know that the, the group that is going to be doing the ecological planning in the area where the controversial Hinton property and the Battle Ground School District property reside are very hopeful that they are buying time to be able to approach the Legislature in order to allow one-acre lots and larger inside urban growth boundaries.

So in many instances we all work at cross purposes and for the most part it has to do with what we see and what we experience in our own lives, in our own neighborhoods. So I would say to you respectfully that I have no meaningful participation in any further discussion that is focused on significant reduction of boundaries or reduction of population forecasts other than to say I will vote no on it, but I'm more than happy to be helpful in whatever way I can be as the Chair to the two of you arriving at those decisions if that's the direction you want to go.

STANTON: Just to clarify. I wasn't talking about reducing boundaries, it was just how much to expand boundaries. And I wasn't talking so much about Cities, I was talking about the Counties taking on more urban land to serve, that's a far bigger concern of mine. And the reason that I had proposed as much expansion in Battle Ground as I did was to get away from the County taking on lands that we couldn't even begin to serve.

MORRIS: Well, there is only one way to achieve that then and that's to move it somewhere else. Because certainly even the proposal that came from Mr. Lee over the weekend does not achieve a reduced number of people that the County provides for, it just reduces the land supply.

STANTON: One of the biggest difficulties of course here is that we don't really have a whole lot from Battle Ground to base theirs on, their boundaries on at this point in time so that makes it pretty difficult when they were the ones that wanted to take more of the population.

MORRIS: I guess I have a technical question, and perhaps this is to both Mr. Lowry and Mr. Lee, if the, if the ultimate disposition here is to reduce the population forecast, then in

order to maintain -- I mean would it also be necessary to reduce the job producing land supply to keep the balance that we've suggested or would we need to go back and re, and change again the jobs to population forecast that was adopted as -- that at least there were a number of votes for to adopt as policy for planning purposes?

LOWRY: I think for internal consistency it might be necessary to go back and check that; however, since the jobs to population ratio is based upon entire population as I understand it, not simply the increase in population, it may be that a reduction in growth rate would not significantly impact acres. I don't know.

LEE: I don't know that it's an absolute need to reduce. Based on the way we've gone about calculating there is at least some linkage. For example, in the mixed use districts you guess both in a population and an employment and depending on what types of lands are taken out it could have an effect on that.

PRIDEMORE: Well, and, Commissioner Morris, I appreciate as experience has shown, Commissioner Stanton and I are not going to agree on everything and your participation in helping to break the individual decisions are going to be appreciated even if you won't be able to --

MORRIS: I didn't say I'd do that. I just said I'd help facilitate the discussion between the two of you. If there is a position that I can particularly like, I would, but if it's a choice between two bads, I won't go there either.

PRIDEMORE: Sure. Okay. And that said, I mean, I'm prepared to begin deliberations (inaudible) tomorrow, allow people if they have final comments to come in tomorrow afternoon, and then just start making the decisions and cranking this thing out. I don't think it needs to wait a month or two months, I think it's something we can move forward with and come to final decisions.

MORRIS: All right. Then beginning tomorrow morning immediately after the appeals we'll anticipate continued deliberation. It might be helpful if you were to give staff a method you'd like to work from, if you want to work only inside the Vancouver UGB, if you want to work around the maps as we have in the past. I think that if I were staff I would like to have some discussion about how at this point in time the deliberations should proceed and if there is any additional material you need from them.

PRIDEMORE: Yes, ma'am.

MORRIS: You don't want to do that?

STANTON: I don't have a recommendation as to how to proceed.

MORRIS: I was asking how -- oh, all right. Okay.

STANTON: I mean I --

LEE: What I think is easy, since we have been working from the basically 11 by 17 exhibits is to sort of focus exhibit by exhibit on proposals for UGA expansion, whether you feel they should be supported or not supported, and if there is any change in the designations that you think would be appropriate and then move on to the next one. I think that's probably the most straightforward approach.

PRIDEMORE: And that's what I would guess as well and that would be helpful if we can just get a range of as we go from those maps. I know you can't sit and calculate and recalculate for each individual decision that's made, but if you can get a good handle for whether we're staying within, you know, our parameters or our numbers and things so that we see at the end what, what does the map look like, then once we've done it, what do the numbers look like that come out of the map. Do you know what I mean?

LEE: Yes. Yes, certainly.

PRIDEMORE: I mean if we pull out Meadow Glade, what does that do to the numbers and at the bottom line what do we have left.

LEE: I do have the other half of the map that was presented today, I could share that with you.

MORRIS: Thank you. Okay. All right. Then we are adjourned and we will reconvene tomorrow morning at 10:00.

(Hearing adjourned at 4:00 p.m.)

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

Betty Sue Morris/s/
Betty Sue Morris, Chair

Judie Stanton, Commissioner

Craig A. Pridemore/s/
Craig A. Pridemore, Commissioner

ATTEST:

Louise Richards/s/
Clerk of the Board